

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXXVII.]

JULY, 1855.

[Vol. XI.]

## INDUCTIVE PHILOSOPHY AND NATURAL AND REVEALED RELIGION.\*

THE rational Christian has continually occasion to notice with regret and shame the spirit of timid compromise which established churches and orthodoxies enforce upon physical philosophers. As in the days of Galileo, so now, the progress of inductive science is barred by foregone conclusions (supposed to be scriptural), which are dogmatical and absolute, usually, in the inverse proportion to their intrinsic weight of evidence. There is indeed no Inquisition, formal and authoritative, among us; but in effect there is a most potent one, before which our geologists and physiologists are now arraigned, and induced to mumble, with forced breath and bated courage, the saving creeds required,—as astronomers once were. And, worst of all, a wretched compromise has been, to a certain extent, effected between the bibliolatrous scripturists and the more timid order of geologists, which is calculated to arrest the course both of physical science and of scriptural criticism at a point most unsatisfactory to intelligent students of each department alike.

It is truly refreshing and hopeful, therefore, to find a man possessing the personal and official qualifications of the present Savilian Professor of Geometry at Oxford, who dares to speak out on the leading matters concerned in this vile compromise. We may indeed wish that he had been more explicit still on certain points (to be indicated in their place), which he has barely touched and so passed by. And where he has spoken out more fully, we may not always accept the specific conclusions to which he evidently inclines. But he has nobly reprov'd the unphilosophical spirit, mixed up of theological (by no means always scriptural) prejudice and physical sciolism, which daily ruins many men as investigators by their sincere participation in it, and many more as promulgators of science by their timid, yet deliberate, conformity or reserve.

We had intimations of Mr. Powell's superiority to this craven spirit, in his "History of the Physical and Mathematical Sci-

\* Essays on the Spirit of the Inductive Philosophy, the Unity of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation. By the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A., F.R.S., F.R.A.S., F.G.S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. Longman. 1855.

ences," above twenty years ago; and more recently and more conspicuously in his able and interesting volume entitled "The Connection of Natural and Divine Truth."

The present volume is (as avowed in the Preface) virtually three books, or essays, which, "though somewhat connected in subject, are yet each distinct and complete in themselves, having been originally composed at different times and with separate objects;"—an explanation which accounts for repetitions and for a want of unity in the volume as a whole. The first essay is an amplification of some parts of a paper on "Necessary and Contingent Truth" in the Oxford Ashmolean Memoirs, 1849, and also covers some of the ground occupied by the author's treatise on the "Connection of Natural and Divine Truth." The second was called forth by the controversy between Whewell and Brewster on the Plurality of Worlds; in reference to the former of whom Mr. Powell says, "it would be absurd to pretend ignorance of his real eminence," though he, of course, only refers to the opinions of the Master of Trinity "as those sustained by the *masked character* under which, doubtless for the greater freedom of such discussion, he has thought fit to veil academical dignity." (Pref. p. vi.) We need not, after this, listen to conjectures which ascribe the Essay on the Plurality of Worlds to a "Mr. Smith," or Mr. Any-one-else. The third essay in the volume before us takes up various questions which are collateral to the main topic of the second, and inquires into the physical history (traceable or conjectured) of creation; its scope being precisely that of the "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation," and the object of the author being to analyze the whole question more philosophically than the author of the "Vestiges," and more calmly than his critics in general, had done.

Such being the general contents of this composite book, we proceed to observe on its successive parts.

The first essay, "On the Spirit of the Inductive Philosophy," is a true lesson for reasoners and thinkers. The Inductive principle is analyzed, and found to consist of the collection of facts, together with the assumption (generally made unconsciously), "that all phenomena of the kind in question are similar to the few actually examined;" the primary assumption involved in the whole process being that of the uniformity of nature, and our successive generalizations correcting the mistakes of earlier ones, and restraining the tendency to hasty conclusions.

Our author protests equally against the *mystical* tendencies of certain modern systems of philosophizing, and against the so-called *positive philosophy*. Of the latter he says, that it "discards all reference to the higher intellectual principles, reducing all science to the naked results of observation and calculation, and all idea of causation to that of mere invariable sequence of phenomena" (p. 5). Of the former he thus speaks:



"The theory of intuitive or internal principles undoubtedly appeals powerfully to the imagination. Nothing seems more natural or plausible than to refer everything to *ultimate principles* originating in the mind: it saves the labour of further analysis, and supplies a specious explanation of intellectual phenomena, which seems to gratify at once the desire of penetrating the secrets of our nature and the love of the mysterious, in appealing to great but hidden causes within us: a species of occult philosophy, which seems eminently to harmonise with the mysticising tendencies of the age; but which, nevertheless, appears to be conceived in a spirit very opposite to that of the simple and *positive* character of the inductive method, and, though sanctioned by great names, seems rather to be a retrograde movement, and to evince a lingering attachment to the scholastic mysticism, or to be in some sense a revival of it." Pp. 9, 10.

The author then insists that, though we may be "*naturally prone* to entertain such notions," we may be in this, as in other things, prone to do *wrong*; and demands that the idea of intuitive principles be analyzed up to simpler elements, which he finds in "processes carried on through already acknowledged intellectual powers." He thus recapitulates (p. 18):

"If there be any force in what has been advanced, then, instead of any primary or inherent principle,—any original element of the mind, enabling it to see the outward world blindfold,—any intuitive internal power to create external facts, any authority derived solely from the interior resources of pure reason to show us physical and material things without reference to the senses, or the like,—the simple analysis of the case would lead us to the more sober belief that the source of inductive certainty, that certainty beyond the mere limits of sense, that superstructure larger than any foundation of facts, is accounted for by natural and acknowledged processes.

"It arises in the first instance out of the power of *abstraction*, acting with unconscious force and powerful rapidity, by whose aid the mind creates what are indeed new conceptions, yet formed only out of materials already furnished, and this *not by addition, but by subtraction* of properties and particulars.

"Above all, the process derives its whole force from the discovery and acceptance of sound and well-framed *analogies*, or, as I have elsewhere said, THE SOUL OF INDUCTION IS ANALOGY; and higher, more efficacious, and more enduring, as the analogies adopted are more strictly accordant with the real harmonies of nature."

In the same clear and decisive tone he disclaims the idea of *à-priori* proof of physical truth, after adducing illustrations of varied science (p. 35):

"Thus a simple analysis of the actual train of argument tends to dispel the mystification and confusion which have sometimes arisen on the subject of abstract reasoning applied to physical subjects. Pure reason out of its own resources may, indeed, create theories apart from all observation of nature; but to make them applicable to anything in nature, such creations of the mind must necessarily and universally involve *some small assumption of material properties* or mechanical condi-

tions; which can only be in some form or another ultimately derived from observation: what is borrowed may be *very little*, but it must be *something*; and it is a point of interesting research to the philosopher to endeavour to ascend to the fewest and simplest possible of such first principles."

The Inductive principle having been thus explained and upheld against the pretensions of more ready-made intuitions, the essay is further devoted to illustrating the Unity of Sciences, the Uniformity of Nature, the Theory of Causation, and the subject of Final Causes. We must not linger at each step, but cull a thought or a passage here and there, to tempt our readers to the book itself. The chapter on the Unity of Sciences concludes thus forcibly and finely, in accordance with the Inductive philosophy:

"The actual laws and profound principles which regulate the mechanism of the universe are the originals; the conception and expression of them in the mind of man only the copies. The vast assemblage of physical causes, the great principles, whether of cosmical force or of the minutest molecular affections, as they exist in the heavens or in terrestrial bodies, are the realities: the exposition and demonstration of them in the mind of the philosopher only their images.

"All science is but the partial reflexion in the *reason of man*, of the great all-pervading *reason of the universe*. And thus the *unity* of science is the reflexion of the *unity* of nature, and of the *unity* of that supreme reason and intelligence which pervades and rules over nature, and from whence all reason and all science is derived."—Pp. 80, 81.

Speaking of the belief of the uniformity of nature as implied in the processes of inductive reason, the author acutely observes that it is, in its proper extent, by no means an intuitive or natural belief; but is, on the contrary, only acquired by philosophical study, and strengthened by gradually extended research, till anomalies are involuntarily regarded as only apparent, fate and chance are excluded, and Law is recognized as the constant indication of the Supreme Mind (p. 112):

"All induction begins and ends in the conception of order, arrangement, and uniformity throughout nature; and this, however inadequately comprehended by our science, is again the evidence of supreme mind, and the universality of order in time and space the manifestation of the universality and eternity of that supreme mind."

He quotes Cæsted (from whose somewhat mystical thoughts he seems intent, in many places, upon deducing true philosophy) as saying with equal truth and poetry: "The laws of Nature are the thoughts of Nature; and these are the thoughts of God."

On the Theory of Causation, our author admits that Hume sufficiently disproved the idea of *efficient* causation as belonging to physical agents, but denies that mere *invariable sequence* is a proper account of the matter. He distinguishes between physical and moral causation, and restricts *efficiency* to the latter.



By physical causation he seems to understand the mere reference of the effect, as a *species*, to a more general and better understood class or *genus* of phenomena, in which more general class he sees design, that is, moral causation (p. 119). Confessedly this is a most obscure point in the connection of physics and metaphysics. Our idea of *causation* is certainly quite distinct from that of simple sequence, though *invariable* sequence; and when we refer the particular effects to such a general cause as gravitation, electricity, capillary attraction, or the like, we do not feel (though perhaps we ought to do) as if referring it, thereby, to a moral causation; but we create to ourselves, vaguely enough, an intermediate physical agency, representative of the whole class of effects, and obeying, and illustrating in its admirable order, the moral Will of the First Cause. Our author seems to deny that the intermediate law is, in any true sense, a *power* or *force*, and rises directly from the classified physical phenomena to the presiding Mind.

"The connection and subordination of inductive laws and generalisations is what we carefully distinguish as *physical causation*. But material *unity*, *system*, and *order*, are the indications of *mind*; and the connected series of *physical causation* is the manifestation of *moral causation*.

"Thus, the truly inductive philosopher recognises *presiding Mind*, the supreme *moral Cause* of all things, everywhere revealed by the same outward manifestations of universal order and harmony; everywhere indicated by the same external attributes, symmetry, uniformity, continuity; and attended by the same ministering agents, invariable laws, and physical causes."—P. 132.

Yet he hazards no speculation whatever as to the *connection* between the moral causation and the physical effects. The world's standing problem, the rack of the ancient speculative philosophies, the question how mind acts upon matter,—which Berkley escaped by idealizing the material universe, which some endeavour to escape by persuading themselves of the materialism of the Divine and Human Mind,—our Inductive philosopher expressly declines touching:

"Of the *mode of action or operation* by which the Supreme Moral Cause influences the universal order of physical causes, *we confess our utter ignorance*. But the *evidence* of such operation, where nature exists, can never be lost or interrupted. And in proportion as our more extended researches exhibit these indications more fully and more gloriously displayed, we cannot but believe that our contemplations are more nearly and truly approaching their *SOURCE*."—P. 168.

In the last chapter of this first essay, which treats of "Final Causes and Natural Theology," the most noticeable point is the earnestness of the author in deprecating the common argument from presumed final causes, and urging instead, that *order, not utility, is the real proof of Intelligence*. He truly says that the term *final cause* is itself not well chosen to denote *purpose or end*

*in view*; that in multitudes of cases the individual contrivance fails of its presumed end, while yet it evinces the law of order all the more strikingly in the failure of the immediate end; and that the instances in which we can trace a use or purpose are comparatively very few. He returns to this subject in the second essay (p. 262), and after quoting Professor Owen and Dr. Whewell as preferring the argument from order to that from final causes, rightly appeals to Bacon as an older authority to the same effect. Yet we shall perhaps find, on scrutinizing our own thoughts, that this recognition of order as all-pervading, is itself suggestive of the belief in a Divine *Purpose*, whether ascertainable or not; and we shall do great injustice to those who, like Dr. Paley, have freely used the argument from final causes, if we suppose they have not been duly conscious of the limited extent of their own observation, and did not duly appreciate the signs of order beyond their narrow knowledge of clear utility. And when this appeal to final causes is made in support of the habitability of other worlds besides our own, the author must admit that it is virtually an argument from analogy as well as an appeal to final causes; for it not only asks what *conceivable purpose* can those immense and innumerable bodies answer short of sustaining happy life,—but it diligently compares all that we know of them with what we *know of this Earth* of ours, and finds resemblances sufficient to justify a strong presumption of the habitableness of some, at least, by creatures not greatly dissimilar to the tenants of this world; while there are diversities such as effectually forbid us to people others of them with any known or definite forms of life, and such as necessitate either the boldest imagination, or else the most reverential wonder, in the presence of Creation's mystery.\* Without denying ourselves this tacit presumption in favour of *analogous bounties* going hand in hand with the *analogous wonders* of creation, we may confess with Whewell,—“I do not pretend to know for what purpose the stars were made, any more than the flowers, or the crystalline gems, or other beautiful objects.” We may believe with Prof. Owen, that to infer facts from “an only conceivable purpose,” is a very hazardous process. Yet, in the spirit of Bacon and every inductive reasoner down to Powell, wherever we “recognize uniformity of plan, *law*, *order* and *unity*, as the true exponents of design,” we shall also find our conviction of design—wise design, good design, kind design, design on the part of Him who formed this earth and its inhabitants—becoming tantamount to the conviction of a *final cause* or *purpose*, vaguely and indefinitely believed in, without attempting to assign the specific utility of each being or each law, but still believed on the analogy of Nature's faith.

---

\* Mr. Higginson, in his interesting work, intitled, “Astro-theology” (pp. 33—38), has admirably stated and duly limited the argument from analogy for the habitableness of the planets.—Ed. C. R.



We have insensibly run into the subject of the second essay. In intitling it "On the Unity or Plurality of Worlds," the author does not regard these two terms as designating the alternatives of the question; for while he holds the unity of worlds (that is, their unity of law, order, system), he does not deny, but favours on the whole, yet without pronouncing very decisively, the plurality of inhabited worlds. As Whewell had already observed, the proper correlative to plurality would be *singularity*, not unity, which, however, he seems to have thought too *singular* a title for even his strange book against the belief in a plurality. The present essayist discusses the question first in a *physical and philosophical*, and then in a *theological*, point of view. He is justified in saying that the recent disputants have left it in a very unsatisfactory state. He truly says, it is a "question of philosophical conjecture or rational probability;" and that "the argument must be based on an extension of inductive analogies." He is disposed to disparage its importance, in itself considered, and to treat as a most unphilosophical weakness the intense interest felt in it by many persons from the days of Copernicus downwards. He appears to hold the nebular origin of our system, but not the present nebulous state of any observed part of the heavens; and from the believed common origin of the sun and planets, he infers that "as they were thus all parts of the same material mass, that mass must have contained, mixed up in it, all the elements of every possible product of nature, organic and inorganic, and the germs of all vitality, even to its *highest* forms, *in so far* as they partake of an animal nature" (p. 208). The conditions of the planets differ only in degree from those of the earth, and there can be "no difficulty in *imagining the possibility*" of suitable inhabitants for any or all. From the analogy of the earth's geological history, there is no difficulty in supposing the planets for a time devoid of inhabitants, and ultimately becoming inhabited. He thus virtually replies to Whewell's geological argument; and he also reproves that learned but random Doctor for laying it down, "in his assumed magisterial vein," that "*Jupiter is a globe of water*;" and corrects sundry other equally rash sayings in his Essay.

But the *radical objection* which he makes to the Whewell and Brewster discussion is, that they have removed it from "its proper basis of inductive conjecture and philosophical probability, and placed it altogether on the new and unphilosophical ground of conformity to theological belief" (p. 237). His quiet ridicule of the whimsical vagaries of the former and of the dull orthodoxy of the latter, is richly deserved, and very grateful to the injured moral sense of the astro-theologian. Whewell's speculations, he says, are a *retrograde* movement towards a moral, if not a literal and physical, Ptolemaism. Their author is masquerading in *mediæval* costume. His earth is to the universe, in astronomy,

what China, in Chinese maps, is to the earth. The feeling of *exclusiveness* which is fostered by the idea of a non-peopled universe around, must be "highly congenial to the mind of a Christian divine, and tend to elevate the conception of a beneficent Creator and the moral dignity of the creature"! (p. 278).

He reviews the "religious difficulty"\* as confessed by Whewell, who is glad to save his orthodoxy by the denial of inhabi-

\* We have never seen a more striking expression of the religious difficulty of this subject than in Mr. Higginson's "Astro-theology:"

"According to the Trinitarian belief, in all its many modifications, the death of Jesus Christ, as the Second Person of a supposed Divine Trinity, was the means of procuring salvation for the human race, or for a certain part of them, who must otherwise have been eternally lost from their Maker's blessing.

"Now, on acquiring the sublime views, which Astronomy opens to us, of other worlds more or less resembling our own, and naturally inferred to be (or some of them at least) inhabited by intelligent beings more or less analogous to our own race,—the 'orthodox' believer inevitably asks himself, what he is to think of the salvability of those other intelligent beings in other worlds. He cannot simply leave this new glimpse of other habitable worlds to the providential care of Him whose inexhaustible beneficence they seem to proclaim. The Theist of Nature can do that. The Unitarian Christian can do it; and feel the happier for even the vaguest thought thus gained of the diffusiveness of Divine love. But the orthodox Christian cannot. So, at least, it is declared by these his representatives in the world of Philosophy. His theological system bids him ask, and answer to his own creed's satisfaction, these questions:

"Do the intelligent beings who may be supposed to people other worlds, need a Redeemer, to do for them what Christ did for the inhabitants of this world? Orthodox believers generally (but not universally) conclude that they do.

"If so, How do they find that Redeemer? is the next question.

"Can the Second Person of the Divine Trinity be believed to have made his incarnation and his expiatory sacrifice in each habitable world in succession? The orthodox believer, it would seem, cannot admit this thought for a moment. I know not exactly why; but he cannot, he does not.

"Can the expiatory sacrifice of Christ then, presented on this earth for mankind 1800 years ago, be conceived to have had a similar influence throughout all the habitable worlds of God's universe? The orthodox believer, who admits a plurality of worlds, is generally driven to this conclusion!

"Yet how hard it is for a really scientific man to make this a part of his belief! When, in the wider atmosphere of Science, he has learnt to look at this fair globe on which we dwell, not as the centre of the Universe, but as one small part even of the Solar System, and that System itself as but a small part indeed of the boundless Universe,—it seems like undoing his scientific thought, to come back in the name of his theology to this same Earth as the centre of the most stupendous spiritual influences to the whole creation. This little Earth is arbitrarily selected from among all the planets of all the Solar Systems in the Universe, to become the centre of a Spiritual Force, before which the functions of gravitation itself in the material creation appear insignificant! Such is the orthodox Christian's astro-theology. It is difficult for him to realize to his own belief his own theory, and solemnly to say to himself that he thinks the inhabitants of Venus and Mars were redeemed from sin by Christ's dying at Jerusalem; and not only so, but that all the habitable planets which he conceives of as probably circling round the Fixed Stars, also recognize this planet Earth (invisible to them, as those planets are to us) as the centre of religious influences the most mysterious but most potent, to them and to the universe. One would almost think such difficulties were strained and imaginary. But no; they are indeed real to the sincere believer in what are called orthodox views of religion, for they are the legitimate consequences of his belief. Astronomy furnishes perhaps the severest scientific test of our Platonic and Middle-age theologies. It brings them face to face with the mighty Universe, and in its wide field reduces them at once to their due proportion in the possible or probable spiritual world, when the Earth itself is seen taking its subordinate place in the stupendous march of the



tants to the universe around, and as feebly evaded by Sir D. Brewster. He rightly traces the existence of that difficulty to narrow views of Christian doctrine, quoting Wesley as restricting salvation at any rate to this one world, while resolutely doubting the habitableness of all others; and he hints that the difficulty arises in many minds from the idea that man's *physical* nature was altered by the Fall,—a notion which our Professor repudiates (pp. 285, 287). All this makes us very desirous to know his own theological whereabouts more exactly; but we only approach it thus negatively, and he seems in one place (p. 291) to deprecate the attempt to *reason at all* on subjects confessedly *above reason*. He also, with a view, apparently, to keep theological difficulties out of the way of his inductive science (which is surely applicable to mental and moral, as well as physical, subjects), makes a curious reservation of "the spiritual nature of man" from the remarks in which he repeatedly connects the human race with the system of things around them. In man, considered in his physical nature, there is nothing unique; and he plainly ascribes the physical origin of our race to the "germs of vitality" existing in the mass of planetary matter from the first evolution of the Solar System. He says (p. 76):

"In a word, man's nature and existence on earth is in nothing of a *peculiar* kind, and in no way violates the *essential unity and continuity* of natural causes:—in regard to man's *animal* nature, because, *so far as that extends*, it wholly belongs to the physical order of things;—in regard to man's *spiritual* nature, because, so far as that is concerned, it is wholly independent of all material things, and is therefore relieved from all possibility of connexion, or collision, with any physical truths, or theories."

Man's spiritual nature is wholly independent of material things! This is a curious specimen of mental philosophy. Again, referring to this passage, our author says (p. 242):

"I have elsewhere endeavoured to illustrate and maintain the simple proposition, that *whatever is* animal in man's nature must be viewed as part of the same physical development and system, as the rest of animated nature: *Whatever is* superior to this belongs to a different order of conceptions, and cannot be affected by any physical considerations. On this view there is an obvious inconsistency in the desire to connect ideas of the spiritual nature of man with the laws of the material world, or to imagine the belief founded on them endangered unless it claim so uncongential an alliance."

Again (p. 298):

"The tenor of the whole preceding argument has been to point out the *independence of the physical order of things, and the spiritual*. It has been maintained that the very idea of a spiritual nature in man, *in so far as it is independent of the body*, belongs to a higher order of con-

---

Creation. And then the orthodox Atonement is proved to be a paralogism in astronomy, as palpably as the Athanasian Trinity is an absurdity in arithmetic." Ed. C. R.

ceptions, of a kind radically different from, and forming no part of, a physical system.

"It is to this class of conceptions that religious doctrines properly refer; and thus it would seem, *on general grounds at least*, unreasonable to expect that the two should have any connexion; or to be anxious, on the one hand, to frame theories combining physical science with religious belief, or, on the other, to imagine the region of physical truth an unsafe locality for a theological creed."

And he speculates elsewhere (p. 465) on the probability that the geological "human epoch" may have been "not the first introduction of the *animal man*, but the endowment of that animal with the gift of a moral and spiritual nature."

This seems, to us, anything but satisfactory and clear. Physical science and religious belief *must, and do*, either combine or clash continually. It is quite impossible to separate their respective provinces. And if we could, we should damage them both by declaring physical science to have no reference to religion, and religion to be unscientific. The following is equally unsatisfactory, drawing a harsh line between the functions of Natural Theology and Revelation, whereas they are both conversant with the same subjects, though the one may supply the imperfections of the other:

"A scientific natural theology does not rise to the aspirations of a spiritual or moral Theism; still less to the scriptural or ecclesiastical doctrines. It tells *very little* of the *attributes*, and *NOTHING* of the *mode* of the Divine existence; but for that very reason it presents *nothing* to *contravene* higher spiritual views *proposed from OTHER SOURCES*."—P. 300.

The "higher spiritual views," we suppose, will include the mode of the Divine existence in three persons, as derived from "other sources," namely, the Creeds and Articles.

If our author is thus timid negatively in what he withholds, he is, as already seen, brave positively in what he says. He concedes (p. 302) that, "within due limits, *theology deduced from philosophy* may be sound and valid. But in every case *philosophy deduced from theology* must be *essentially* erroneous and fallacious; it is no longer *philosophy*." We are glad to find him referring (though we wish he had quoted the passage,—one better worth quoting than some passages from CErsted) to Mr. Kenrick's Essay on Primæval History for some "excellent remarks" (p. 304), which we quote below, as our author does not.\* He refers

---

\* "The apparent flexibility which Scripture has exhibited in the hands of its commentators, and the contradictory opinions which have been deduced from it, may have led those who are not conversant with Hebrew philology and biblical hermeneutic, to suppose the meaning much more uncertain than it really is. No doubt, the Hebrew language and literature present greater difficulties to an interpreter than those of Greece and Rome. Job and Hosea are not of such simple and obvious construction as Homer and Euripides. It happens, however, that the portion of Scripture which relates to cosmogony and primæval history, is remarkably free from philological difficulties. The meaning of the writer, the



again afterwards to this very reliable authority on an ethnological matter. It is satisfactory to see such a book beginning to be recognized as an authority at last.

We have left ourselves too little space for noticing as they deserve the contents of the third essay, "On the Philosophy of Creation." By the *creation* of the world (or of the universe) is only meant "its history, *so far as we can trace it*, towards its first origin" (p. 318). It is "no more than an expression of our ignorance as to the *mode* of the first origination of the material world."\* The evidence from geology is first traced; then that derived from physiology; a third chapter brings the evidence to yield up some general conclusions; and a fourth considers their bearing on "the theological view of creation." Geologically, the author doubts the theory of progression of species, and holds, with the late Professor Forbes, that there is no real interruption in the continuity of physical laws in past eras, any more than in the existing order of things; he disowns the idea of successive periods of creation (in the sense of the origination of new orders of plants or animals); he admits no sudden or inexplicable agency; and considers it "perfectly clear that *the introduction of new species was a regular, not a casual phenomenon*; it was not one preceding or transcending the order of nature; it was a case occurring in the midst of ordinary operations going on in accordance with ordinary causes. \* \* It is part of a series. But a series indicates a principle of regularity and law, as much in organic as in inorganic changes" (pp. 359, 360). Physiologically, our author repudiates Cuvier's idea of investigating organized beings partly in reference to the "conditions of existence," and adopts exclusively Geoffroy's "unity of composition," or reference of all species to a single ultimate type;—which seems to us, we confess, mere *esoteric* philosophers as we are, not at all inconsistent with Cuvier's *teleology*, or reference to the designed *end* of the creature's existence. Surely the acutest comparative anatomist, who traces the "ultimate infinity and coalescence of species" from the zoophyte up to man, sees with

---

only thing which the interpreter has to discover and set forth, is everywhere sufficiently obvious; there is hardly, in these eleven chapters, a doubtful construction or a various reading of any importance, and the English reader has, in the ordinary version, a full and fair representation of the sense of the original. The difficulties which exist arise from endeavouring to harmonize the writer's information with that derived from other sources, or to refine upon his simple language. Common speech was then, as it is now, the representative of the common understanding. This common understanding may be confused and perplexed by metaphysical cross-examination, respecting the action of spirit upon matter, or of being upon nonentity, till it seems at last to have no idea what *creation* means; but these subtleties belong no more to the Hebrew word than to the English."—Pref. p. xiv.

\* This is typified at the head of the essay, and also on the binding of the volume, by a lively pictorial representation of the Hindoo physical theory, which places the earth on an elephant's back, and the elephant on a tortoise, who, in his turn, stands upon a ?

equal clearness their divergences at every step, and the accordance of these with their circumstances; and few can avoid feeling that there is a purpose or design in each instance, whether distinctly apparent or not, in spite of the prohibition laid upon us by the inductive philosophy against being swayed by an appeal to final causes. Of course we ought not to let our perception, still less any mere theory, of final causes, blind us either to specific differences or to generic analogies. But we are told that the school of Geoffroy was strongly opposed to the followers of Cuvier on the imagined rival claims of "unity of composition" and "teleology." Such quarrels has science, pure science! Theology is not the only field of controversies both warm and futile!

This "unity of composition" is strikingly seen in that continued conformity to the type, which prevails even where it is not needed for any *final cause* (but where neither does any final cause demand a departure from it); as in "the trowel of the mole, the paddle of the whale, or hoof of the elephant, where every bone is equally present, but all enclosed in one case. So, again, the abortive teeth of the young whale are of no use except to prove its relationship with terrestrial mammalia. \* \* Nothing is made in vain, if it be only made to preserve unity of system" (p. 367). Really, this "unity of system" is in danger of becoming itself a final cause!

Like all comparative anatomists, our essayist traces the unity of composition in the foetal structure and developement, as well as in the adult forms, and finds in the earlier foetal stages of the higher organisms a nearer analogy to the mature state of the lower ones. By this process, and to this extent, an analogy is shewn to subsist even between the vertebrate and invertebrate creatures, all having an archetypal form in common "up to a certain stage, beyond which their peculiarity of character is superinduced."

All this is very interesting and curious, as it is quite undeniable. And if the physiologist only notices with equal care the circumstances under which the "peculiarity of character is superinduced," *in the foetal state of each species*, he will be in no danger of adopting as philosophy the brilliant but transparent delusion, lately popularized from Lamarck by the author of the renowned *Vestiges of Creation*, to the effect that these germs of life may have been developed successively from molluscs, through tadpoles, birds, quadrupeds, apes, into man! That dazzling theorist could talk complacently of *changed circumstances* gradually, through a series of ages, developing a higher organism; but the only real meaning of such a phrase would be (if a meaning were insisted upon), that the mollusc germ destined to be developed into a frog was transferred into the more favourable circumstances of *frog-spawn*, when, by the supposition, no frog-spawn existed; and that each lower species in succession was transferred into the



foetal circumstances of the destined higher creature, to be retained there for fuller developement, when, by the supposition, those very circumstances were at that period wanting! Our author is too philosophical to adopt any such flashing sciolism; and (what is more noticeable perhaps) he is not afraid of publishing and arguing upon the interesting physiological facts which were lately so strangely perverted. His essay is a complete reply to the "Vestiges," while most candid and temperate.\* He maintains the permanence of species as a general rule, while admitting the possibility of changes having occurred in certain cases, within that limited degree in which the naturalist is sometimes doubtful whether to count separate species or not. On the vexed question whether mankind are all one *species*, he seems to incline to the negative (pp. 381, 382). We cannot now follow him in his recondite elaboration of the "question between evolution of organized beings out of their inorganic elements or out of pre-existing forms," and other "speculations, all essentially hypothetical." Our remaining remarks must have reference to what he says of the bearing of his preceding arguments on the theological view of creation.

He reproves, with good reason, and with pleasant, quiet sarcasm, that craven spirit of conformity which scientific men commonly evince in deference to the clergy and the church:

"There exists, unhappily, too great an unwillingness on either side to meet such questions with perfect honesty and fairness. The astronomer, the physiologist, or the geologist, for example, may be fully enlightened as to the extent to which some of the conclusions of his own science may clash with certain received articles of popular belief. But, devoted to that science, and caring more to relieve it and even himself personally, from hostile insinuations, than to promote any higher views of truth, he more naturally than philosophically seeks to conciliate the matter in an ambiguous phraseology; as if accepting literally the irony of Lucian, who, after relating a story of a philosopher having been maltreated by a mob for attacking some of their superstitions, adds,—'And very justly; for what right had he to be rational among so many madmen?'"—P. 441.

With kindred severity our essayist speaks of the bigotry which, from Galileo's day till now, has regarded each advance of science as irreligious; he hints that "in the minds of *all competently informed persons*, the belief in the Judaical cosmogony has already died a natural death;" he reproves the "indiscriminate and unthinking bibliolatry" of the prevalent theology; and, with pleasant irony, cites the influence of English sabbatism on science as follows:

---

\* In a note (p. 424), after referring to an article written in refutation of many of the minute details of the theory of the *Vestiges*, he adds,—“But however open to criticism may be the details of particular physiological statements in the work referred to, the whole tenor of the preceding discussion will shew the degree in which I cannot but concur in its broad philosophical principles.”

"Extensive tables of certain observations are still printed, in which every *seventh* entry, instead of degrees, minutes and seconds, is filled up by the word 'Sunday.' It would be a curious calculation to find the real value of a *mean* deduced from such a column."—P. 472, note.

We are somewhat at a loss to know what place our author finds in his philosophy for the specialties of a miraculous Christianity. We have already mentioned his attempted reservation of all moral, spiritual and metaphysical subjects, as beyond the pale of the inductive philosophy. He speaks thus vaguely and (we submit) absurdly of the Christian doctrines at p. 475:

"The Christian doctrines, from their very nature, are conveyed in the language of the spiritual world; they belong altogether to a higher order of things; and where they may be expressed as in any degree related to material objects or events, these representations cannot now be canvassed in detail, nor be interpreted as falling within the province of physical investigation, or as involving what are described as supernatural mysteries, in any alleged physical difficulties. The truths they embody shine calmly by their own heavenly light, like the stars above the brightest illuminations on earth."

Mere verbiage is this,—the "ambiguous phraseology" in which, if we did not know him to be a clergyman, we should suppose the astronomer, physiologist or geologist, just spoken of by him, was endeavouring to "conciliate the matter." Those gentlemen are accustomed to talk to clergymen precisely in this cloudy but irrelevant strain.

As to the question of the Christian miracles, his careful reservation of moral and spiritual topics allows, we grant, ample room for the admission of the supernatural illumination of the minds of Christ and his apostles. But as regards the *outward* miracles recorded in the gospel history, we continually feel, in reading his statement of physical principles, that he, as it were, precludes the possibility of any deviation from, or supernatural addition to, the law of absolute physical uniformity. And his allusion to Mr. Babbage's Ninth Bridgewater Treatise and Calculating Machine (p. 473), seems to shew "that instead of interruptions," he is willing to regard miracles "rather as instances of the observance of some more comprehensive laws unknown to us,"—a well-rounded platitude, as we take it, which is simply inapplicable to the Christian miracles of stilling a storm, curing disease, multiplying food, raising dead persons; for they are not a *class*, physically viewed, but embrace the most miscellaneous instances. They are indeed a class if viewed spiritually, if viewed in reference to the benevolence of Christ which inspired them, or in reference to the *final cause* for which we believe them to have been vouchsafed. But "final cause" is (as we have seen) a forbidden word with our author. And however he may spare it in Physics, we cannot in the Evidences of Christianity, nor indeed in our contemplations of Natural Theology.



## MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. MICHAEL MAURICE.

BY REV. EDMUND KELL.

To those who were acquainted with the Rev. MICHAEL MAURICE, who from his advanced age and retirement from the world for many long years, seems to have departed from our midst even before his actual decease, a brief memoir of one who possessed so deep a hold of their affections will not be unacceptable. Forgotten he will never be by his more immediate circle of friends, who will oft recal his fervent piety, his cordial friendship, the warmth with which he entered into every plan of benevolence, his truly apostolic appearance—in him the index of the worth within.

But I have a deeper interest in the brief memoir I am penning than the gratification of personal affection and friendship. I loved him! But, following the example of the early Christian writers, I would record his errors with his virtues, believing that in the world of spirits, where neither human censure nor human plaudits can vex or gladden his soul, he would rejoice that from his grave the warning voice should plainly point out the stumbling-block which was large hindrance to the stamp, the light, of holy truth he might have left on other minds. But let the narrative I have to give speak its own lesson.

The Rev. Michael Maurice was born in 1767, at Pudsey, a large manufacturing village about four miles from Leeds. His father was an orthodox Dissenting minister, and his early education was under the paternal roof. He afterwards went for eight years to the grammar-school at Leeds, where, under the able tuition of Dr. Brown, he became an excellent classic. His choice was for the ministry, and for it he studied at Hoxton Academy, under Dr. Abraham Rees, Dr. Kippis and Dr. Savage. He appears to have entered the Academy in 1782, when in his sixteenth year. His only companion who entered the Academy that year was the late Rev. John Rowe, of Bristol. Among the senior students whom he found at Hoxton were Mr. Tremlett, afterwards minister of Gloucester, Palgrave and Hapton; Mr. Russell Scott, of Portsmouth; Mr. William Hughes, of Sidmouth; Mr. W. J. Hort, of Cork; Mr. John Coates, of Birmingham, &c.; and Mr. Harry Toulmin, of Chowbent. Amongst his juniors at Hoxton were Mr. Edwards, of Birmingham; Mr. Wiche, of Monton; Mr. Broadhurst, of Bath; and Mr. Lee, of Belper and Hull. Before Mr. Maurice's academic course was completed, the Hoxton Academy closed its career. Dr. Kippis, its classical tutor, was compelled by his numerous literary and public engagements to resign his post in 1784, after occupying it for twenty-one years; and it was the year following, 1785, that the Academy broke up, on the resignation of Dr. Savage and Dr. Rees. Dr. Savage, the theological tutor, was a mode-

rate Calvinist; the other tutors were Unitarians. Hackney College arose immediately on the discontinuance of the Academy at Hoxton, and to it Mr. Maurice, together with Mr. Rowe and Mr. Broadhurst, removed in September, 1786. He appears to have been, from the official list, a student on the foundation, the letters M.F. being appended to his name, which is the second on the list, following that of Mr. Rowe, who, though a divinity student, was not on the foundation. He continued only one session at Hackney, having, in addition to the gentlemen already named, as companions, Mr. David Jones, Mr. Joseph Lomas Towers, Mr. Jeremiah Joyce, and, for two-thirds of the session, Mr. John Jones.

On quitting the College at Hackney, he succeeded his brother-in-law, the Rev. G. C. Morgan, at the Old meeting, Yarmouth, as colleague or assistant of the Rev. J. M. Beynon. In Aug. 1792, he accepted the office of afternoon preacher at the Gravel-Pit, Hackney (Dr. Priestley being the morning preacher), which he retained until July, 1794, when he was succeeded by the Rev. John Kentish. He had the honour—and a high, though melancholy, honour it was—of assisting Dr. Priestley, in the April of that year, to pack up his books and scientific apparatus for his departure to America.

Soon after he had left Hackney, he married Priscilla Hurry, the daughter of a merchant at Yarmouth, a member of the Old meeting, and opened a boarding-school at Kirby, about seventeen miles from that town. Here he conducted divine service one part of the day in his own house, and the other at Gildestone, where his friend Mr. Dowson fitted up a room for the purpose.

After residing a few years at Kirby, he removed his school to Normanston, a beautiful residence a mile out of Lowestoft, on the margin of Lake Lothing. It was a favourite resort of the poet Crabbe. He was the minister of the Presbyterian congregation at Lowestoft for eleven years, conducting service in the afternoon, and highly valued in the town for his public spirit. It may be noticed that this congregation had enjoyed the benefit of several eminent ministers. Its first minister was the celebrated confessor, Thomas Emlyn, previously chaplain to Sir Robert Rich, of Rose Hall, near Beccles, in that neighbourhood, who was one of its first trustees. While there, Emlyn became very friendly with a fellow-sufferer for conscience' sake, William Whiston, vicar of the parish, and adopted some of his doctrinal views. Dr. Samuel Clarke occasionally visited Whiston there, and probably Emlyn also had intercourse with that eminent divine. For many years afterwards, its ministers were for the most part Arians. Mr. Samuel Say (son of Mr. Giles Say, ejected from St. Michael's parish, Southampton) was a fellow-student and friend of Dr. Isaac Watts, and afterwards successor to Dr. Edmund Calamy at Westminster. Mr. Thomas Scott,



another of its ministers, was author of a poetical translation of Job, &c. To him succeeded Mr. Alderson, grandfather of the present learned Baron of that name. The trust-deed of the chapel simply provides that the building shall be "used for the worship of Almighty God." After Mr. Maurice's leaving Lowestoft, the chapel passed into the possession of the Independents, who about three years since built themselves a new church and sold the old building to some Reformed Wesleyans. Mr. Maurice left Lowestoft about 1812.

In 1815, he succeeded the Rev. Jillard Hort at Frenchay, and there also he kept a boarding-school, and was much esteemed, taking part in the various religious associations of his brethren in the West of England. He left Frenchay in 1824, mainly in consequence of a change of doctrinal opinion in his family, which prompted them to make such efforts in support of their religious views as practically interfered with his ministerial usefulness. Thence he went to Sidmouth on account of a daughter's health, and whilst there preached at the Presbyterian chapel. At his departure, in 1825, a silver waiter was presented to him as a "testimony of respect," "in remembrance of his valuable services."\*

He went from Sidmouth to Southampton, where he received a few pupils, his daughters carrying on a school; but he never afterwards settled with any congregation, or indeed desired to do so, as the decidedly Trinitarian tone which prevailed in his family would probably have prevented his being acceptable. He still, however, had his heart in the ministry, and made himself very useful to his brother ministers in the South, with some of whom he lived in the closest intimacy, and who will, with the writer, gratefully record the kindness with which he often favoured their congregations with services which were in a high degree impressive. In the September of 1825, he preached the annual sermon before the Southern Unitarian Fund Society at Portsmouth, and during his residence in Southampton cordially co-operated with the neighbouring ministers in the promotion of the Society's objects, in conducting week-evening lectures in the different towns in the district. For one year, 1832, he kindly acceded to the request of the Society to become its missionary, and periodically to visit such of the congregations in the district as were disposed to avail themselves of his pulpit ministrations. At the close of 1831, he supplied for two months at the New meeting-house, Birmingham, prior to the pastorate of the Rev. S. Bache. An engraving of him was there taken, which is now in possession of many of his friends. In the early part of 1833, he officiated for some time at Portsmouth, previous to the settlement of the Rev. H. Hawkes; and he performed the same

---

\* *Christian Reformer*, Vol. XI. p. 213, 12mo edit.

friendly office for a month, in 1835, at Bridport, assisting at the inaugural service of the Rev. P. Harwood. These casual services he willingly undertook; but several times the Southern Unitarian Fund Society earnestly solicited him to open a room for worship at Southampton, for which funds would have been provided; and he always declined, on the ground that by mingling with Trinitarians freely and uncontroversially, he was doing more good, by softening their prejudices and liberalizing their minds, than if he were openly to endeavour to establish Unitarian worship. Let those who know Southampton now, judge whether his views of policy which publicly and privately moulded so much his religious course, wrought any work of good. If he spoke not out what he believed, with noble Christian manliness, what profit was it that he lived on terms of intimacy with Revds. Dr. Wilson, Dr. Draper, J. Crabbe, T. Adkins, Mr. Bullar, and other ministers at Southampton, both in and out of the Establishment? Yet he valued truth itself for his own life's good. And had it been scientific truth, how sedulously, with all a father's love, would he have infused it into his children's minds soon as they had mental strength to bear it! how zealously proclaimed it to his brother man! Is it because religious truth is truth eternal, the highest, noblest truth which man can know, that our friend—and many, alas! besides him—think that the God of Truth has left them free, untouched of culpability, to choose whether or not they may in quietude pass on, and niggard hide their light?

In 1835, he removed to Reading, where his daughters conducted a school, and after a residence there of about ten years settled in London, whence he never removed. It may be mentioned that he was one of the twelve venerable ministers, having "reached a period of life beyond its average," who signed a Petition to Parliament in favour of the Dissenters' Chapels' Bill.\* The writer of this brief sketch saw his aged friend twice last year at his residence at Notting Hill, when, though weak in body, he retained his mental faculties in considerable vigour, and manifested a lively interest in the welfare of his old associates. He inquired after the condition of the Southampton Unitarian congregation, and, when informed of its well-being, marked his high gratification by a hearty grasp of the hand, and the expression of very fervent wishes for its increased prosperity. He died at his home, Ladbroke Villas, Notting Hill, April 6, aged 88.

His family consisted of one son and eight daughters. The son, the Rev. F. D. Maurice, is preacher of Lincoln's Inn and founder of the People's College. With his literary labours many are acquainted. He went to Cambridge and afterwards to Ox-

---

\* Debates on the Dissenters' Chapels' Bill, p. 427.



ford, and at college contracted intimacies which exercised some influence on the future connections which the family formed. He married first a sister of the wife of the Rev. John Sterling. His second wife was sister to Archdeacon Hare, author of "Guesses at Truth." Several of the daughters committed their writings to the press, and were the authoresses of "Aids to Development," "Memorials of Two Sisters," "Prayers for the Sick Poor," &c. Two became the wives of clergymen, Archdeacon Hare and the Rev. J. C. Plumptree (also a preacher at Lincoln's Inn). Four of them died before their father.

In the life of the Rev. Michael Maurice, chequered as it was with many changes, *active benevolence* was the distinguishing trait. From its commencement to its close, he was the warm friend of his brother man, whether suffering under kingly or priestly oppression, whether struggling for liberty in Europe or for emancipation from cruel bondage in America. In politics, he was in close confidence with the leaders of the democratical party from 1791 to 1794, and was one of the ardent Reformers over whom the Tory government exercised an espionage which compelled them to hold their meetings in secret. Throughout the long contest for the abolition of the Slave Trade, and afterwards of Slavery in the West Indies, he took an energetic part, and was the intimate friend of Clarkson and Zachary Macaulay. He laboured strenuously for the removal of the Catholic disabilities, stimulating all whom he had power to influence to the same efforts. Addressing the writer on the virulence of the clergy against the Roman Catholic claims, under the leadership of the late Sir Robert Inglis, he exclaims—"Alas! that possession of ecclesiastical authority should be supposed to justify the debarring others from what God intended them to possess! \* \* \* When will men differ without being angry with each other? When will they discuss without becoming furious?" In 1822-3, he was deeply interested in the Spanish Constitutional attempt which was suppressed by the Duke d'Angouleme's army, and went the length of taking, in support of his opinions, a considerable number of Spanish Cortez bonds, which were afterwards repudiated, and I believe ultimately lost. He gave his willing aid to British Schools, and took an influential part in the Philosophical and Literary Society of Southampton, in which, being possessed of considerable literary attainments and much fluency, he was relied upon not only for regular lectures, but to supply the emergencies of casual disappointments. He was a member of the Bible and Peace Societies. He also belonged to a Society for the improvement and instruction of the Gypsies, who abounded in the district of the New Forest, and to one for the prevention of Climbing Boys in chimneys. In short, there was hardly a society for the moral and physical amelioration of his fellow-

beings to which he did not give freely of his means and of his active efforts.

He appears from the commencement of his ministry to have been a Unitarian. It must have struck all who knew him that he was a devout man, ever conversing in the Christian tone; and his public prayers (which were always extempore) and his sermons were impressive and devotional.

I will extract a summary of his religious opinions from his "Account of the Life of John Bawn," which first appeared in the *Christian Reformer*,\* and was afterwards published with additional sections. I quote from the separate publication.†

"The Protestant professes to receive the Bible as the only rule of his faith and practice. By that standard the Unitarian wishes to be examined, as by that he believes he must hereafter be judged. When, therefore, he is accused of denying Christ, he asks, In what manner do I deny him? I believe him to be what the Scriptures declare him to be,—the Son of God; sent by the Father of mercies to seek and to save. I regard him as the author and finisher of my faith; the publisher of glad tidings; the teacher and perfect example of righteousness. I receive him, not only as proclaiming life and immortality, but as the faithful witness of our resurrection in his own resurrection and ascension to glory. I believe that he will come again, as the Judge of all the world, and that he will render to every man according to the deeds done in the body. The Unitarian can add his persuasion that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah foretold by Moses, proclaimed by the prophet Isaiah, and in the fulness of the times bringing in the Covenant of Grace and Truth, the Covenant which abolished the ceremonies of the Jewish Law, and invited the Gentiles to participation of the blessings of Revelation 'in this life and in that which is to come.' And can any one be said to deny Christ who thus believes? who believes that the miracles Christ performed proved him to be the Son of God with power, and that him hath the Father raised from the dead, and exalted far above all principalities and powers, and appointed to be 'head over all things to his Church'? But let it not be supposed that there is no ground for the Unitarian being accused of denying Christ. He does deny Christ the titles and honours which those creeds confer upon him which call him God of gods, very God, &c. These are appellations the Unitarian cannot employ, for the Scripture hath declared of the living and true God, 'My name is One, and my glory will I not give to another.' The first commandment is, 'Thou shalt have no other gods besides me; thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'"

He further evinced how deeply he was imbued with the value of "the truth as it is in Jesus," in the following interesting remarks:‡

"From Divine Revelation the Unitarian learns to regard God as the

\* Vol. VIII. p. 256, 12mo.

† *An Account of the Life and Religious Opinions of John Bawn*, pp. 35, 36.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 45—48.



Father and Friend of all. He addresses Him as the God of Love, without respect of persons; full of mercy, long suffering, forbearance and forgiveness. He has therefore no fear that the all-powerful and all-wise Creator will select some of his rational offspring for felicity, and doom others to eternal misery. He recollects the declaration of Jesus, 'If earthly parents know how to give good gifts to their children, how much more will your Heavenly Father give good things to those who ask Him!' He therefore believes that all things are working together for good for the upright in heart. Hence is the value of the gospel shewn, by enabling its sincere advocate to have consolations this world can neither give nor take away; for 'neither life nor death, nor things present nor things to come, are able to separate the faithful from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.' Life and immortality are not only taught, but confirmed, by the resurrection of Jesus. Herein is the love of God manifested, in presenting to us a living testimony that 'although in Adam all die, in Christ will all be made alive.' Death thus loses its sting, and the grave its victory. 'Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory!' who enables us to pass through the dark valley without alarm, assured that He will not leave nor forsake those who trust in Him. \* \* \*

"It is the full conviction of these truths that enables the Unitarian to meet death without fear. He knows in whom he has believed, and that he is able and willing to keep what is committed unto him till the great day. He therefore confides in the goodness and mercy of his Heavenly Father. He neglects no means either to strengthen his faith or to animate his hope. He prays with fervour for that sincere repentance, that godly sorrow, that needeth not to be repented of. He trusteth not in his own righteousness, but pleads the free mercy of God which is promised to those who forsake the evil of their ways, and turn unto the Lord with full purpose of heart. He entreats that he may banish every forbidden thought, and cherish a holy zeal for the spread of divine truth, and for the extension of the kingdom of heaven. He studies the example of Jesus, especially when the bitter cup was soon to be presented to him; and when pains and sufferings and the prospect of dissolution are near, he supplicates, 'If to live be appointed, may I live to the glory of God; if to die be appointed, may I be fitted for my removal: not my will, but thine, O God! be done.' Is it then wonderful that the Unitarian should have peace and hope and joy in dying? Has he not abundant cause to apply the consolatory declaration, 'Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord; even so said the Spirit, for they rest from their labours and their works do follow them'? He admits he has been an unprofitable servant; but he is taught that 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' God, through the gospel, is reconciling the world to Himself; and is thus the just, whilst he is the justifier of all those who diligently seek him. How cheering, how animating these truths! Well may they induce the sincere Christian to say, when 'absent from the body,' I shall be 'present with the Lord'!"

Notwithstanding this full conviction of the truth of his own religious faith, there was, however, a want of fidelity in the open profession of it, which I mention with regret, and which could hardly have been expected from a colleague of Dr. Priestley.

I speak of it now because I have often mourned over the same error in others, which has proved, and which must prove, greatly detrimental to the cause of Christian truth. With a fixed, a firm belief in the doctrine of the Divine Unity, and with a desire for its wider diffusion, he yet hesitated not, nor seems to have recognised inconsistency, in bowing the knee with those who send up their prayers to a Triune God. At Lowestoft he conducted divine service, as we have said, in the afternoon (his chapel being closed in the morning), telling the writer, with the utmost apparent unconsciousness that he was swerving from the line of religious integrity, that the arrangement was concerted with the clergyman to admit those who desired it to attend his services also. At Southampton he himself ordinarily attended the ministry of Mr. Bullar, the afternoon preacher at the Independent chapel,—the Rev. T. Adkins, the morning preacher, being known so frequently and violently to attack Unitarians from the pulpit, that he could not with any self-respect be his hearer. Such compromise could not be—it seldom is—unproductive of evil. In his family it led to a disunion in religious opinions which clouded his life, and was a permanent blight on his future ministerial usefulness. It might almost have been predicted, indeed, that his children, habituated to the impression that they could alike join in worship in which the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Unity was believed, would be drawn towards that religious community which was more attractive either from its numbers or the worldly advantages which it offered, and so would be at the mercy of any accidental influence to determine their religious course. Nor can we be surprised that the partner of his life, although brought up among the Presbyterian Dissenters, should at Frenchay, I believe, under the excitement caused by the change to Trinitarianism of Dr. Stock, of Bristol, have become a Trinitarian. Nor do we wonder that the chapel at Lowestoft, where as a minister he was much respected, fell after he left it into the hands of the Independents. We cannot help seeing that our friend's failure of religious consistency produced only its natural effect; and with all the affection I ever cherished towards him, I always felt that his want of decision in not speaking out his opinions, in not influencing the religious opinions of his family, was deeply inimical to the cause of holy truth. Our numbers are small, and small they will continue to be whilst fathers and mothers give up their children to the influence of the orthodox. It is on individual fidelity,—fidelity in all its broad extent,—that our healthful growth as a Christian community must depend. There may be those who regard the conviction of the Unity of God as of no vital importance, and who found churches which shall not avow belief in His sole supremacy, though their worship be addressed to Jehovah alone. This theory, which in our day loves to vaunt itself



on its proud unsectarianism, was much acted upon by the English Presbyterian congregations of the latter half of the last century and the beginning of the present. It then proved itself to be a decided failure as to the preservation among them even of freedom of thought; and the result will be now, as then, that through indifferentism to any distinctive faith such congregations will dwindle and die, or their chapels, as in the case of Lowestoft, will too frequently be handed over to the Trinitarians; for in the future of such churches, when the minister of enlightened views is withdrawn, the impulse of the spoken, of the prevalent opinion, will bear sway, and the church will assume some recognized belief in regard to the Object of its worship.

And let me solemnly ask, Is it right to hold religious opinions of the highest importance in this nebulous, this latitudinarian form? I aver that it is not; that no man is justified in any carelessness or lukewarmness in the reception or diffusion of opinions which touch the being of his God; that it is the imperative duty of conscientiousness, without which a man does not discharge its entire obligations, to strive to have clear ideas of the God whom he worships. The Creator surely is not entitled to less respect (oh, how much greater should we bring to Him!) than that we pay to inferior objects. Nor can we see how any one can feel a deep interest in the things which are eternal,—can love his Heavenly Father “with all his heart and soul and strength and mind,”—who does not bring all his powers to the apprehension of what that Father has revealed of Himself. Can it be a question of light import whether that adoration be paid to Jesus and to the Holy Spirit, which should be offered only to the One Jehovah? Surely the child to whom the Great Eternal has opened his Book of Life, should never forget that the Lord his God has declared Himself to be “a jealous God, who will not give His glory to another.” Let those who believe that their God is a Triune Being openly speak it. They have full right to profess the opinions they honestly maintain. But let not the Unitarian countenance by his presence the worship of the anointed Son, who said, “See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them that keep the sayings of this book: worship God.”\* For defence of the Unity of God, Servetus nobly suffered at the stake. Lindsey, with the approbation of all good men, counted as nothing the means of worldly subsistence, but, listening to the dictate of conscience, came forth from his vicarage at Catterick, not knowing what was before him save “freedom to worship God.” And a glorious triumph would open upon our church, if all who believe that “God is One” would follow his bright example.

We have seen that the Rev. Michael Maurice argued, that by

mingling with the orthodox, and in their presence tacitly ignoring his own religious convictions, truth might ultimately be best promoted. I do not believe that even the good opinion of the orthodox is to be obtained by compromise. With them, through the whole of life, I have lived on terms of Christian courtesy. With them I have co-operated, and continue to co-operate, in all great philanthropic movements; but I conceive that this mutual confidence has been created, this cordial co-operation obtained, not by the oblivion of principle, but by the conscientious maintenance of principles I deem important. We may judge, indeed, of the real feeling of other communions towards Mr. Maurice after his compliance in attending worship with Trinitarians, by his being impelled, from deference to their prejudices, to withdraw his name from the Committee of the Southampton Bible Society, and from not being allowed to address its meetings. It is indeed a question whether the cause of Unitarianism has not been retarded rather than promoted in Southampton in consequence of Mr. Maurice's compromising views. O, had he stood with firm consistency on the rock of holy truth, then might his family have laid their talents, with ten other talents more, upon its altars! Is it a small evil that they should revert to a belief in the crude mysteries of the dark ages, from which their father, by judicious education and by laborious scriptural investigation, had emerged? And his son, the best known of his children, I cannot but think might have been far more extensively useful, had he started on his career from the point of knowledge to which his father had attained, and exerted his intellectual abilities for the benefit of mankind, uncramped by those Creeds and Articles of his Church which sit so clumsily upon him. And how much of mental anxiety would he not have escaped! He would have escaped the unhappiness of having his feelings outraged by some doctrine of his Church at which his heart recoils. He would have been spared the endeavour to prove, forsooth, that the Athanasian Creed has a charitable intent, and the labour of working out some view of the Atonement in which the goodness of his own heart is predominant over all the orthodoxy he would strive to infuse into it. And the doctrine of Vicarious Sacrifice, which he gave up as irreconcilable with the attributes of God, would not have been his to encounter; nor the doctrine of the Eternity of Hell Torments, with which his reason struggles and at which his soul sickens. O, it could not be that he could be brought up under the roof of his loving father, whose life was spent in labours for the good of others, and believe that *that* father would be everlastingly punished by the benevolent Being whose conduct he was so far striving to copy. Impossible! We only marvel that he had not more of the light of his father's mind; and while his admirers have been lauding his liberality in diverging a hair-breadth from the popular creed, some among us have



the rather felt regret and pity that he should have trodden back truth's pathway, encumbering himself with all the fetters of a nation's earth-born creeds—have retrograded from the pure religious faith of his parent; and we have deemed him responsible for not availing himself of the better information which would have been the highest boon a father's love could give him. While we say this, we freely accord to him our estimation for his avowals in the "Theological Essays," which we know were written in the anticipation that they would lead to his exclusion from the Theological chair in King's College. And we will trust that the Rev. Frederic Maurice, seeing that his Church refuses to give any consideration to his more liberal views of Christian truth, will, if he does not think himself bound to leave her communion, devote his time to more useful objects than the vain attempt to reconcile her creeds to common sense, to consistency and charity. But whatever opinion we entertain respecting his religious course, all will appreciate his efforts for *popular education*, and in them wish him Godspeed! Hail to the Founder of the People's College!—a title by which, if we mistake not, Frederic Maurice will be in future distinguished, and not as a polemic. In throwing himself so entirely into this movement, he is truly following the example of his father, who, in a letter to the writer in 1837, seems to have foreshadowed this work, when speaking of the best means for conquering bigotry and intolerance. He writes—"Nothing will produce this effect but education,—education in the fullest and widest sense. Educate all classes. Begin with Infant Schools; encourage Temperance Societies; promote Mechanics' Institutions. These will prepare for Philosophical Institutions," &c. The mantle of the father has in such efforts descended on the son.

I have said of the subject of this Memoir that I would speak alike of his errors and of his virtues. In the same spirit I say to the readers of this sketch,—In living out religious truthfulness, take rather the standard of Priestley and of Lindsey; but in philanthropic effort, I may point also to the example of Michael Maurice, and say, "Go and do thou likewise!"

---

#### TRUTH AND MERCY.

THEN "Mercy and Truth shall meet together." Here is a great deal of "truth" among professors, but very little "mercy"! They are ready to cut the throats of one another. But when we are brought into the right way, we shall be *merciful* as well as orthodox; and we know who it is that saith, "If a man could speak with the tongues of men and angels and yet want *that*, he is but sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." *Carlyle's Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.*

## MR. HIGGINSON'S SPIRIT OF THE BIBLE—THE NEW TESTAMENT.\*

WHAT an amount of intellectual energy has the Bible been the means of calling forth,—in its elucidation and in its defence—in setting forth its real claims to the love, respect and veneration of mankind, and in repudiating those mistaken assertions which have, alas! too often been made on its behalf, by which its true lustre has been impaired, and its right to the gratitude and confidence of the world undesignedly, but effectually, brought into doubt!

We have before us, in Mr. Higginson's *Spirit of the Bible*, a gratifying proof that as the Bible has not yet "had its perfect work" in the souls of mankind, so neither is the mental vigour wanting which can, with truthful, patient earnestness, devote itself to the task of clearing away the corruptions which have in the lapse of ages gathered around its pure doctrines,—presenting them in their native simplicity to those who are willing to learn,—and removing the obstacles which impede their acceptance and their usefulness. We may add, that his success in reference to those topics which he has discussed, is not less manifest than his sincerity and zeal. His learning and diligence are great; his fidelity to truth unshrinking; and he has achieved that usefulness which can hardly ever fail to accompany the employment of diligence and learning, directed to an important object, under the guidance of great ability, and prompted by a faithful and a trusting spirit,—which confides in the God of Truth, and relies on His goodness and mercy to cause the "manifestation of the truth" to redound to His glory and man's benefit. We do not mean to pin our faith on Mr. Higginson's, or to assent to every opinion that he has expressed. That would be very contrary to his own precept and to the example of freedom which he has given; but we do say that he has produced an eminently original, truthful and, in our opinion, useful book,—free in discussion, yet reverential in its tone,—very interesting, from the important nature of the questions which it examines,—and which, while it shews the marks of extensive reading and careful thought, is still far removed from the pedantry and dulness which sometimes cause works of solid learning to be "caviare to the general." This is, in fact, a *readable* book; and though it will be acceptable to the scientific student of the Bible, it will be both intelligible and pleasing to non-professional readers.

The first volume was noticed with distinguished approbation in our number for February, 1854. The present is in every

---

\* The Spirit of the Bible; or the Nature and Value of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures Discriminated, in an Analysis of their several Books. By Edward Higginson. Vol. II., containing the Apocrypha and the New Testament. Post 8vo. Pp. 526. London—Whitfield. 1855.



respect equal to its predecessor; and, as it embraces the New Testament, will no doubt be perused with even greater interest.

It commences with a short introduction to the Apocryphal books which are usually appended to the Old Testament. Mr. Higginson has done wisely in not overlooking these works, which throw much light on the state of religion among the Jews previously to the advent of Christ,—on the philosophy, the superstitions, the social feelings, which then prevailed,—on the manner in which the Old-Testament Scriptures were understood, explained and applied,—and on the expectations which the nation cherished of an approaching deliverance. Our limits, however, will not permit us to dwell on this part of the book.

We pass therefore to the portion which treats of the New Testament. It opens with a chapter on “the Claims of Christianity as a Divine Revelation;” and here we are glad to perceive that Mr. Higginson is not one of those who would ignore the broad line of distinction between faith and unbelief, by defining the term *Revelation*, when used in this and similar statements, in such a sense as would leave to Christianity nothing higher than a purely philosophic origin. He truly says,—

“Christianity claims to be a divine revelation. By this we understand that it professes to be something beyond the ordinary course of Nature,—taking that term *Nature* in its widest meaning, to include both the ordinary phenomena of the outward universe, and the constitutional faculties of the human mind as taught and developed by the ordinary course of phenomena and events around it.

“In one sense, indeed, the Religion of Nature might itself be called a divine revelation. God is known in His works. The Scriptures themselves expressly point to the works of Nature as manifestations of the Supreme Being. ‘The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork.’ ‘The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; even his eternal power and godhead.’ Christianity, in announcing itself as a revelation, admits, or rather assumes, all this as its very basis. It assumes that man has a religious *Faculty* to which it may address itself; and that the *Creation* in which he stands and the *Providence* which is over him have already imparted to him some perception of religion. It necessarily assumes all this, when it professes to give him additional religious knowledge and a higher religious culture.”—Pp. 69, 70.

From these principles, as a starting-point, the author, by a natural process, conducts his reader through a brief but satisfactory discussion of the many topics bearing on the position of Christianity, as a religion claiming a supernatural origin and asserting a special authority:—the harmony of Nature's teachings, rightly interpreted, with those of Divine Revelation, properly understood; the credibility, nature and use of miracles, and the limitations under which they are to be received as true; their position in the evidences of Christianity, now and in past

ages; and the application of criticism to the records of Christianity, in common with all other ancient historical documents.

The germ of the following remark may be found in other works; but Mr. Higginson presents it with a clearness of expression and conception which is altogether his own:

"The miracles of the gospel history are of two kinds, *physical* and *spiritual*, or outward and inward;—those wrought in other persons or things at the word of Christ or an apostle, and those wrought upon their own minds by the Divine inspiration. The outward works were those that commanded the largest, or at least the earliest, attention in our Lord's own day; but the great spiritual miracle of his inspired mind and character is that which constitutes the Gospel itself, as a revelation from God to man.

"Now it seems obvious to notice the necessarily changed relation in which these two classes of miracle stand to the gospel evidences, through the mere lapse of time and remoteness of place. A physical miracle *seen* must have a very different effect upon the mind from a miracle *reported*, especially one belonging to a distant age and country. The miracle seen, is felt as a proof of something else; but the miracle reported, is felt to want proof itself. When the outward miracles of Christ were done before men's sight, defying explanation from natural causes, carrying with them an evidently benevolent purpose, and, above all, having the warranty of such a character and life as that of the Saviour, his personal disciples saw in them the true signs of a divine mission and conclusive proof of his superhuman qualification to teach and guide them. They argued that 'no man could do such miracles unless God were with him.' They regarded him as 'a man proved to be from God by the miracles and signs which God did by him.' They looked to him, therefore, for disclosures of important religious truth, beyond their natural and their hitherto revealed knowledge, but in harmony with all their highest perceptions of truth. Their conscience received with reverence, but without violence to its highest dictates, his expositions of duty, confirming at once and exalting their natural sense of right. Their faith welcomed his promises of spiritual and immortal blessedness, as meeting the most anxious desires and satisfying the highest faculties of their nature.

"But it would be a great mistake to attempt to prove the truth of Christianity to an inquirer *now*, by appealing first to the outward miracles of Christ. Those miracles are the very things that *now* chiefly require proving. We do not believe Christianity to be divine because of its outward miracles; but we accept its outward miracles as belonging to it and perfectly in accordance with it, when we believe it to be divine in itself. Its internal, spiritual miracles are the great proofs by which it now wins assent,—the character of Jesus Christ, the heavenly wisdom of his precepts, the purity and elevation of his morality, the breadth of his philanthropy, the sublimity of his doctrines respecting God and His providence, His will and His designs, and, lastly, the disclosure of human immortality. Because we cannot account for these internal characteristics of the gospel except by admitting its superhuman origin, we accept the *INSPIRATION OF CHRIST*, the inwardly miraculous part of his mission. Then as to the outward miracles, which we find



to be quite inseparable from his history and in strictest harmony with the spirit and objects of his mission,—we accept them as credible in that connection, and as sustaining the unity of impression made by his whole life and teaching,—though, *if* we could look at them as unconnected with the spiritual design and spiritual characteristics of the gospel, we might and ought to feel that almost insuperable philosophical difficulties attached to them.

“This is, I believe, the ordinary process of thought by which an intelligent belief of the miraculous in Christianity takes place;—first to accept Christ’s character and work as genuine and true in itself, and to feel that inspiration is its true and only solution; and then to feel that the outward array of miracle is not only an inseparable accompaniment in the record, but an appropriate and harmonious one in the idea; that the superhuman in the inspired soul of Christ has its fit expression in benevolent miracle. In this respect, the order of conviction is the very reverse of what we must suppose to have been customary with our Lord’s contemporaries, who were first struck with the outward miracle, and afterwards perceived more and more fully the inspiration and holiness of his mind. Yet even with them, the latter became, as it is with us, the fount of Christian principle and hope; the former had but pointed the way to it.”—Pp. 86—88.

In the next chapter, the author considers “the Christian Era in its Connection with General History,” with especial reference to the literary activity of the time, the moral condition of the world, and the relation of Judea and the Jews to the Roman Empire. Here Tacitus is the principal authority; and excellent use has been made of the materials which he has furnished. We have then chapters on the Christian Scriptures in their Place among Ancient Books; on the Canon of the New Testament; and the Relation of Christianity to Judaism. These form what may be termed the *Prolegomena* to this division of the work. Its most important part consists of the dissertations specially devoted to the separate books of the New Testament.

Of these, the Historical Books are first considered; and here the first question which presents itself, is that respecting the date, authorship and sources of the four Gospels. Mr. Higginson gives good reason for rejecting the assertions made by some celebrated German theologians and their followers, respecting the non-existence of the canonical Gospels till the middle or latter end of the second century,—an hypothesis, indeed, which is so utterly destitute of proof and probability, that it is difficult to conceive how it could ever have been seriously believed or maintained, otherwise than as a paradox. How, indeed, is it conceivable that a writer recording the predictions of Christ respecting the overthrow of the Jewish nation and its capital, long after the event had taken place, should drop no hint or allusion pointing out to his readers the remarkable accuracy with which the prophecy had been fulfilled, even within “the generation” to which its accomplishment was limited? Nay more,—as Mr. Higginson

acutely and, in our opinion, *justly* remarks,—how could the writer of the Gospel which bears the name of Matthew, mix up in his narrative and his mind, as he manifestly does, the predictions relating to the destruction of Jerusalem and those which had reference to the general judgment, if the book was written when the accomplishment of the former and the non-fulfilment of the latter, must have enabled even the dullest intellect (though the evangelists were not dull) to distinguish between the event which was immediate and that which was remote when both were foretold? We do not believe that this argument is at all unfavourable to the credibility of the evangelist as a witness of what he professes to have seen and heard. He has not scrupled to avow that he and his fellow-disciples “understood not the sayings” of Christ respecting his own death, till the *fact* taught them the meaning of his words. It is no disparagement of him and them to affirm that in another case they might and did misconceive his meaning previously to the occurrence of the fact predicted; but had they committed their histories to writing after the event had taken place, it would have removed their error, and would have kept right any person who at a still later period might have presumed to set forth narratives in their name. (See pp. 300—303, *n*.) Mr. Higginson does not remember to “have seen this argument any where stated,” nor do we; but it seems to be well-founded,—for the transition which almost all commentators suppose Matthew to have made, *consciously and designedly*, at ch. xxiv. 36 or 42 (for they differ among themselves, and it matters not which of the places be assumed as the transition point), has always appeared to us incredibly harsh and violent.

On one point we differ from Mr. Higginson. He regards the Gospel of Mark as probably the earliest written; to us it seems that the strongest internal proofs point out that of Matthew as the first that was given to the world; and it is notorious that such was the opinion of *all* the ancient writers who have considered the question, without a single exception. But to discuss this point would exceed our necessary limits.

We regard with satisfaction the protest which Mr. Higginson has recorded against the wild and weakly supported, though skilfully arrayed, hypothesis of Bishop Marsh, who attempts to explain, by a series of suppositions, destitute every one of proof, and in their aggregate of even the semblance of probability, how three writers, treating of an important series of historical events, have related the same facts in many cases in almost the very same words, yet without having in any one instance had the slightest acquaintance with each other's writings. In the case of any other historians, the explanation of this phenomenon would be very simple. The second writer, it would be said, had copied, with variations, omissions and additions, from the first;



and the third had in like manner availed himself of the labours of both his predecessors;—and this being admitted, it would be easy to understand both the coincidences and the discrepancies. But this would be far too short and simple a view to satisfy the requirements of refining theologians. It was taken for granted that the independence of the evangelists as attesting witnesses required that the later among them should never have had access to what the earlier had written. They were therefore believed to have been shut out as completely from the knowledge of each other's works as the seventy interpreters inclosed in the cells of Alexandria, according to the Jewish fable respecting the origin of the Septuagint. At first their mutual similarity,—in some places approaching to identity of expression,—was viewed as the result and evidence of divine inspiration; but this idea had to be given up when it was perceived that in some places where there was the closest accordance in the *words* of the narrative (which are of no importance), there were very wide discrepancies in the time, place, person and order of the facts. Various efforts were made to explain the matter without admitting the possibility of transcription, chiefly by German theologians; but Bishop Marsh, in his *Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of the Three First Gospels*,—appended to the 3rd vol. of his translation of Michaelis' *Introduction*,—left all competitors far behind\* in the profundity of his investigations, the elaborate completeness of his system as viewed in the mutual adaptation of its component parts, and the minuteness with which he professes to unveil the sources not only of each Gospel, but every fact, speech and paragraph in each Gospel. He lays it down that there were two original documents in the Hebrew language (not one, as Mr. H. supposes), from which the evangelists drew their statements, and that each appeared in successive and numerous editions, the total number of which he does not profess to ascertain; but he proves that there were at least six substantially varying recensions of the first, in Hebrew, with a Greek translation of each, making twelve different editions, which were in circulation about the same time. The editions used by our canonical evangelists were the *fourth, fifth and sixth*;—that to which Matthew had recourse, he consulted in the original Hebrew; Mark and Luke employed Greek translations of their respective editions. We adopt the words of Mr. Higginson on this point.

“Whether any satisfactory theory has been yet suggested to account for the mixed harmony and divergency of the Gospel narratives, it may be difficult to pronounce. Nor is it reasonable, indeed, to expect that

---

\* The learned Prelate was in the strictest sense the author of the theory propounded in this Dissertation. Michaelis (whom Mr. H. looks upon as its father) merely suggests the existence of *one* common document, and that in *Greek*. (See *Introd.* Vol. III. p. 94, Eng. Tr.)

we can, by the exercise of the subtlest criticism, resolve those ancient books into the elements from which their writers may have composed them eighteen centuries ago, and decide precisely which parts had been previously put into writing, and how those more ancient writings were used by our evangelists,—which parts were current in apostolical forms of oral instruction, and which were derived from the personal knowledge and memory of the individual writer, or those to whom he had special access. We do not attempt thus to resolve other ancient histories and biographies. Xenophon wrote memoirs of his master Socrates (the *Memorabilia*); and Plato, another disciple, wrote those immortal *Dialogues* in which he is understood to have ascribed to his master some of his own philosophical refinements, in addition to the strong wisdom of Socrates himself. But no one thinks it necessary to ask (still less, to answer or to guess) what earlier records of the instructions of Socrates may have existed before Xenophon and Plato wrote. There may possibly have been older written memoranda of that great teacher's doings and sayings, on which, as well as on the faithful stores of memory, the memoir writers of the great heathen Sage could draw. There may have been; or there may not have been. If there were, no doubt Xenophon at least, as more truly the biographer, used them intelligently and faithfully. If there were not, he at least diligently put into writing what was already cherished in many a faithful and loving disciple's memory as well as his own. We cannot, however, reach farther back than to Xenophon and Plato. They are *to us* the original biographers of Socrates. And so are the evangelists of Jesus Christ. We can go no higher than their works. Of whatever there was previously written in their day, no doubt they made the best use that they could. But whatever that may have been, it is all long since lost. The evangelists are *to us* the original authorities. Still, if Plato had written *Memorabilia* as well as Xenophon, or if two other disciples had produced memoirs of that simpler kind, while Plato's *Dialogues* gave us, as they do, his master's philosophy as seen through the medium of his own,—scholars would, no doubt, have found it a curious and interesting task to *harmonize* the three memoir writers, and also to look at the whole life from the point of view assumed by the fourth. And if they ventured to conjecture the prior existence of some primitive memoir or memoirs, they would put forth the idea very modestly as a mere literary theory, and would not consider it any detriment to the authority of the extant memoir writers, that they had found access to still earlier memoranda of the life of Socrates. If they found (as no doubt they would have done) great verbal agreements as well as great differences in the three *synoptical* memoirs of the Sage, they might perhaps have accepted the theory of partial records of an earlier date, to account for the correspondence; or they might perhaps have thought it a sufficient explanation, to remember how weighty his sayings often were in meaning, and how terse and striking in their style of expression, and how it was the habit of his most devoted pupils to recal them to each other's thoughts whenever they met, reciting them in affectionate emulation, and supplying each other's defects of memory, till they had almost gained, in this their oral publication, the form in which Xenophon presently afterwards perpetuated them beyond further risk of change."—Pp. 257—259.

And after explaining Bishop Marsh's theory, he adds,

"To accept this hypothesis, must require a rare union of deep critical skill, vivid imaginative power and self-reliant judgment, such as I neither profess nor expect in my reader. It is a mere hypothesis for the very learned and very clever; it is no solution to the many careful and earnest students of the New Testament."—P. 261.

In reference to the text of the New Testament, Mr. Higginson will probably be judged by many as somewhat too conservative in his views: for example, he accepts as genuine the last twelve verses of Mark, ch. xvi., of which Griesbach in his *Commentarius Criticus* expressed very strong doubts, and which have been explicitly rejected by Tischendorf in his last edition of the Greek Testament, by Tregelles in his *History of the Text*, and by other critics.

With respect to the canon, we remark that Mr. H. coincides, though hesitatingly, with the judgment of Origen upon the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who pronounces the sentiments to be those of the apostle Paul, but the style that of another person, and therefore concludes that it was dictated by Paul, but composed by some amanuensis, who expressed in more elegant Greek what the venerable author dictated in his own less polished language. To this theory, however, there are very grave objections, which we do not think it necessary to state at present. The Epistle of James he accepts as genuine; the second of Peter and that of Jude he is inclined to doubt; but the Apocalypse he explicitly rejects, at least so far as its rejection is implied by the denial of its commonly asserted authorship. After many years' careful study of this question, we agree with Mr. Higginson, that "it seems quite impossible that any one who is able to read this book in the original, should for a moment ascribe it to the writer of John's Gospel and the three Epistles" (p. 499); but for the reasons on which this opinion rests we must refer the reader to the *Spirit of the Bible* itself, where they will be found clearly but briefly stated.

It is out of our power to go minutely into the examination of a work which treats of a great variety of important subjects relating to the Bible and the doctrines which it unfolds. We trust we have said enough to shew the value which we attach to this book, and to manifest the useful and interesting nature of its contents. We have been much impressed by the deep earnestness which is apparent in every page. This earnestness has thrown a prevailing character of reverence over the whole work: it is therefore not merely critical, but also practically devout. It is calculated to impress the mind with a profound veneration for the gospel, as well as to guide to a correct understanding of its contents. The same earnestness has led to the utmost freedom of research, and candour in the statement of the results attained by investigation. No mistake can be more gross than to suppose that reverence for the Scriptures requires us to draw off our minds



from the consideration of their origin, nature and authority. To suppose that such intellectual torpor is necessary to the student of the Bible, is really disrespectful to the Scriptures; to suppose that it can be pleasing to God, is impiety; to suppose that it is needful to suppress the conclusions which have been reached by the process of free but serious and earnest thought, is to abandon alike faith in God and man. We are apprehensive, nevertheless, that some readers will charge Mr. Higginson with want of due reverence, because he has in this, as in his former volume, discarded some notions which were once thought essential to the due recognition of the Scriptures as the great authority in determining the truths of our faith, and which, though long since renounced by multitudes of thoughtful men in every church, still have their advocates and adherents, perhaps in all churches. Of course we have chiefly in view the notion of a divine inspiration as applied to the sacred books. Mr. Higginson puts the Scriptures in what appears to us their proper place,—as the *Records of Revelation*, not as themselves *the Revelation*. It is evident that the writers of the New Testament claim for their own works no higher rank; and we cannot ascribe to them a divine inspiration in any rational, intelligible or honest sense of the term, without rendering it impossible to believe in their truth. For it is manifest that they abound in discrepancies,—not important, it is true,—but yet real, actual, undeniable discrepancies. These discrepancies are what we expect in truthful historians, each giving his own impression of the facts which he records; and therefore they in no degree shake our faith in the reality of the main events which the histories relate. But the occurrence of any one discrepancy, however slight, is fatal to the credibility of a set of books claiming to be divinely inspired; for where there is real discrepancy, there must be error, on one side or the other; and error and divine inspiration cannot co-exist. What, indeed, is the use of divine inspiration but to guard against error? To attempt to prove that error and inspiration may *both* be predicated of the very same book, which itself marks out no such distinction between its own contents, is only to practise a fraud upon others and ourselves. We rejoice to see this plain truth put strongly forward and consistently carried out.

Closely connected with this question is that relating to the cogency of the passages from the Old Testament which are cited in the New as having been “fulfilled” in the person and history of our Lord. They have perplexed many a brain. Some have argued that they were all literal prophecies of Christ, and were all literally fulfilled; but this required an obtuseness of understanding which, it is to be hoped, did not characterize all those who really applied their minds to the question. Surenhusius thought he had found a key to unlock the mystery, in the formulas of citation used by the rabbis of the Jews, who often

employ the phrases, "that it might be fulfilled," "herein was fulfilled," &c., where no actual accomplishment of a prediction was intended to be asserted or implied. Professor Palfrey (whom Mr. Higginson follows) draws a similar explanation from certain expressions found in classical writers. He cites a few; it were to be wished that they were more numerous and more convincing. At least they are not quite convincing to our minds. We have still our doubts. In fact, it seems to us plain that in *some* cases the evangelists and apostles did really believe certain passages of the Old Testament to be prophetic of the personal character, history and work of the Messiah, which had in reality no such signification. They have quoted these supposed prophecies as *proofs*, and argued from them as *grounds of faith* in his pretensions. What then can we say, but that the evangelists and apostles were, in these examples, mistaken in their judgment? But this does not in the slightest degree impair the value of their testimony to the facts which they either beheld with their own eyes, or learned from the mouths of eye-witnesses. We apply to this class of passages the same sort of reasoning which has long been applied to the narratives of demoniacal possession with which the first three Gospels abound. The evangelists have related a fact, and mixed up with it the expression of an opinion. The fact we accept without difficulty or hesitation; but the opinion, if it seems to us unsupported by proper and sufficient reason, we feel at liberty to reject. Nor does it seem to us material whether the unsupported opinion relates to the cause of a disease, or to the applicability and literal fulfilment of a supposed prediction. Men who were mistaken in one such case, might err in both.

We conclude as we began this article, with a hearty recommendation of the *Spirit of the Bible*. We regard it as a work most suitable to the aspect of the present times in reference to religious questions, yet containing truths and principles the enunciation of which is important at all times. We accept it as one of the pleasing proofs lately afforded, that the great work of diffusing sound scriptural knowledge, in which our predecessors laboured so successfully, is, after too long an interval, returning to the denomination in which it may be prosecuted with the greatest freedom and success; and we rejoice to find, from the publication of the second volume following so speedily after that of the first, that the public are still willing to listen to what a true and faithful man is desirous of declaring to them respecting the *Spirit of the Bible*.

ψ.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### SECULARISM AND UNITARIANISM.

It must be known to our readers that, during the spring of this year, a course of lectures by various Unitarian ministers was addressed to the Secularists of London, and delivered at the John-Street Institution, Fitzroy Square. The scheme of the lectures was as follows :

1. The Causes of Unbelief among the Working Classes: by the Rev. John Gordon.

2. Religion indispensable to the Moral Development of Human Nature: by the Rev. Henry Solly.

3. True Religion expressed in the Life and Teachings of Christ: by the Rev. J. J. Tayler.

4. The Recognition of the Distinction between Religion and Science essential to a Right Understanding of the Bible: by the Rev. T. L. Marshall.

5. The Christian View of Human Life and Destiny: by the Rev. Thomas Madge.

6. The Right of Free Inquiry in relation to Christianity, and its accompanying Responsibilities: by the Rev. Charles Clarke.

While the lectures were being delivered, brief reports of them appeared from week to week in *The Reasoner*, which is the organ of the Secularist party. These reports were drawn up with fairness and intelligence, and manifested an acute perception of the characteristic peculiarities of the lecturers, as well as a clear apprehension of the points on which the lectures turned. After the course was closed, Mr. G. J. Holyoake delivered a Review of the whole series in the John-Street Hall; and this Review has been published in the numbers of *The Reasoner* for June 10 and June 17.

We have read Mr. Holyoake's production with considerable interest; and we wish to record some of the impressions it has made upon our mind.

We should think few persons acquainted with the Secularist controversy could peruse this Review without acknowledging that a salutary effect has resulted from the lectures to which it was a reply. Its spirit and tone are not only superior to those of previous discussions with which it may be compared, but are decidedly favourable to the ascertaining of the real merits of the matters discussed. Its sentiments, too, even when they very widely differ

from the conclusions we deem to be true, are modified in no small degree by what had been advanced in opposition to them. There is moreover indicated something like a disposition to look toward the difficulties of the Secularist case, and we willingly confess to a much higher estimate of the Mr. Holyoake of these pages, than we had formed of the Mr. Holyoake who was a party to the Grant and Holyoake fights. We must not, however, be understood as approving altogether even of the manner in which Mr. Holyoake has conducted his part of the debate before us. We think he was bound, in answer to what had been said, to enter more deeply into the philosophy of his own views than he has attempted to do, instead of contenting himself with offering objections to particular statements of his opponents.

A discussion with Mr. Holyoake and his friends naturally directs itself upon two topics: the reality of Religion, and the value of Christianity.

As to the first of these topics, we understand Mr. Holyoake to deny reality to Religion, and to contend that the things and circumstances of this world embrace the only interests by which human life should be directed. In confutation of this limited view of the destiny of man, it was argued, that the material philosophy which was relied upon in its support was falsely and inconsistently pressed to anti-religious conclusions; and that both the nature and the condition of humanity pointed to religion as the supply of a necessary want.

Now what does Mr. Holyoake say in reply? Instead of meeting Mr. Gordon's argument as to the false and inconsistent application of materialism to the facts of the case, he rides off upon an attempt to identify materialism with causation. How that attempt helps his position we are quite unable to see, and the only inference we draw from it is, that the material causation which Mr. Gordon had shewn ought not to exclude religion, was found, upon reflection, not capable of accounting for all the phenomena with which it had been identified. On the other hand, when dealing with the arguments of Mr. Madge and Mr. Solly in favour of the testimony of human nature and human life to the reality of religion, he repre-



sents their doctrine as a mere dependence upon wishes and presentiments which they desire to substitute for ascertained truth. Here again the essential character of the reasoning is completely missed. The construction of the nature of man and the facts embracing his destiny are the legitimate means of proving the truth concerning him, as distinct from any fancy he may indulge, as well as from any philosophy in which he may enclose himself; and the declaration that "no system can meet the wants of any truthful nature except that which is compatible with the convictions," would, we suppose, be accepted by the gentlemen just mentioned as expressive of the very opinion which Mr. Holyoake brings it forward to condemn. So far, then, it is tolerably clear that, with regard to the subject of Religion, Mr. Holyoake has simply avoided the case that was put before him.

We turn to the other topic: the value of Christianity.

It is difficult to speak of Mr. Holyoake's sentiments on this subject, because he appears to us to have no just appreciation of the facts relating either to the history or the character of Christianity. He is evidently prepossessed by an anti-religious theory which disables him from entertaining the subject with the sympathy necessary to the comprehension of what it means or intends. In the few remarks he has made upon Mr. Clarke's lecture, he seems to deny to Christianity that kind of influence which the mere philosopher who should compare it with other movements of society, would, as a matter of course, concede. "Agreeable complacencies," is certainly an unfortunate phrase by which to describe an endeavour to set forth the world-wide operation of the religion of Christ in its bearing upon human welfare. It is, however, Mr. Tayler's lecture which presents the occasion for the most distinctive estimate of Christianity with which we are favoured. Mr. Tayler had exhibited the Life and Teachings of Christ as expressive of True Religion. Mr. Holyoake cuts the knot of the difficulty presented to him by denying the worth of the religiousness itself of which Christ was the type. His conception of religion is nothing more than the cultivation of secular action under a divine sanction, and he discards from his faith all recognition of God in the purely spiritual form which embraces the essential truth of the subject.

He sees no method of reconciling what he calls "the Ethics of Heaven and of Earth" as developed in the teachings of Christ, and he considers the progress of civilization as disproving the truth of such filial dependence upon the Deity as the life of Christ displayed. Thus the real question in dispute is left in Mr. Tayler's hands. Nothing has been done to interfere with his position, that if Religion be a reality, Christ is its true pattern. It may be correct that Christians have but imperfectly apprehended and unfaithfully followed this pattern; but that it does, in those respects which excite Mr. Holyoake's disapproval, offer the most perfect representation of the subject conceivable, is, to us, beyond reasonable doubt; and as little do we doubt that human nature can only rise to its destined elevation by cherishing the religious spirit which in this instance reached so divine a height.

The inconsistency between Christ and Paul as to the sphere of religious operation, is a thing of Mr. Holyoake's own imagination. Paul's exhortation to be "diligent in business," is no more secular than Christ's command to be "faithful in the unrighteous mammon." The inconsistency alleged to exist between Christ's teachings themselves, is made out by the adoption of orthodox modes of interpretation which are manifestly inapplicable to the circumstances with which Mr. Holyoake had to do.

We have indeed to complain that, in more than one instance, Mr. Holyoake tries to make Unitarianism responsible for opinions which, as he should know, are opposed in principle to that form of Christianity. Thus he quotes a monstrous passage from a sermon on the "Sin of Unbelief," by a Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, as though the fanatical doctrine it contains could be or ought to be agreeable to Mr. Tayler's views of Christianity; and he attributes to Mr. Marshall the doctrine "that *God adapted* his scientific allusions to the ignorance of his people," as though Mr. Marshall was bound to accept a theory of scriptural inspiration which we understand him distinctly to have repudiated. It should have been carefully kept in mind throughout this Review, that one of the main objects of the Lectures on which it animadverted was to present Christianity in a more reasonable form than that which orthodoxy supplies, and, in the instances just referred to, the principles of interpretation by which

Unitarianism is distinguished should have been fairly met or freely granted. To say, as Mr. Holyoake does, that "Unitarianism snaps asunder that wonderfully devised link of human sympathy, the idea of God in Christ," is to assume that the orthodox form of that idea is the true scriptural form of it; for he must be aware that the idea, as thus expressed, is professedly held by Unitarians as one of the most prominent doctrines of their Christian faith. He himself accuses them of "extolling the human nature of Christ up to the point of celestial perfection and infallibility."

We cannot refrain from making a concluding observation upon a passage which seems to us to present the inherent weakness of the Secularist theory in a somewhat striking light. The passage is as follows, and the lecturer referred to is Mr. Madge:

"Because virtue often suffers, and vice attains public success, he presses to know, on the supposition that this life is all, how we can combat this discouragement? We answer, that to the man educated in integrity, virtue is never absolute suffering, and vice never appears to such a man success. He views such success with disdain, and combats it as a policy. Next we say, that the state of society in which the prize of life *can* fall to the vicious, is a proof of the moral impotence of Christianity. It is on this very ground that Morelly proposed, and we justify, the problem of Communism, which is to find the conditions in which it shall be *impossible* for men to be depraved or poor."

Were we in Mr. Madge's place, we should be content to leave the question in dispute to be decided according to the fate of the problem stated above. If the Secularist theory waits for the solution of that problem, it will never rise above "the moral impotence" which it at present shares with Christianity. The Utopia to which it looks for its justification, is at least as far off as the Christian Heaven. Meanwhile, in contending "that to the man educated in integrity, virtue is never absolute suffering, and vice never appears to such a man success," the Secularist advocate takes an essentially anti-secularist ground, which will much more logically lead him to a belief in immortality, than to a dependence upon a mortal condition "in which it shall be impossible for men to be depraved or poor."

#### BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The thirtieth anniversary of this Association was celebrated on Wednesday, May 30th, at Little Portland-Street chapel. The Rev. G. B. Brock, of Exeter, was the preacher of the day, and the Rev. Francis Bishop, of Liverpool, conducted the devotional part of the service, which, as well as the subsequent meeting, was numerously attended. We understand that Mr. Brock's excellent and appropriate sermon is to be published by the Association. The object of the discourse was to unfold the distinguishing vital principle of Christian faith and duty. This was shewn to be a devout filial temper, homage of mind and heart, of worship and of life, to one infinite Father in heaven. Scriptural proof, inferential and direct, of this position was presented. In addition, evidences in support of it drawn from the natural relationship of God to man, and from human spiritual wants and aspirations, were adduced. In the second place, the development and application of the principle in furtherance of the general religious aims of our denomination, were descanted upon. It was spoken of as identical with a true living Christian faith,—as the befitting agent for the promotion of the prosperity of our churches,—as the right-quickening and consecrating power of social religious services,—as a motive and bond of united benevolent action,—as a stimulus to the growth, and a guide to the right direction, of human intelligence and civilization,—and as the promoter and safeguard of human mental and spiritual freedom. In conclusion, some notice was taken of the application of the principle to the interpretation of the Scriptures, and here was briefly stated the incompatibility with it of the leading doctrines of the popular theology.

After the close of the service, the Chairman, W. Briggs, Esq., M.P., called upon the Rev. T. L. Marshall to read the annual report of the Committee, who were indebted to the Resident Secretary, Mr. John Webb, for its preparation. The following may be presented as an outline of its more important features:

After reference to the recent Parliamentary proceedings respecting the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the motion by Mr. James Heywood for the removal of those clauses of the Act of Uniformity which impose religious

tests upon various national educational institutions, and a well-merited compliment to Mr. Heywood,—the report adverted to the contemplated publication of an improved version of the Old Testament, the time being now arrived at which such a scheme might properly be undertaken. The Committee inclined to the opinion that the known existing translations should be adopted as far as practicable, and they thought it desirable that a separate volume of notes should be printed. As regards the literary execution of the work, the Committee hoped to be favoured with the assistance of the most learned theologians of the Unitarian body. Reference was next made to the past and present condition of the Unitarian body in respect to the supply of settled efficient ministers for its pulpits. The Committee trusted that it might become widely known that in no case had public religious worship been discontinued; that the vacancies which existed some time since were now reduced one-half; that the Manchester New College, London, had now fifteen divinity students,—a large increase upon former years; that two gentlemen were still studying for the ministry under the auspices of the Association; that the Unitarian Home Missionary Board had sprung into existence for the purpose of supplying the domestic missions and rural congregations with suitable pastors, and that several gentlemen were prepared to occupy Unitarian pulpits so soon as suitable opportunities occurred.

After a tribute to the memory of the late Revds. E. Cogan, W. Stevens, R. Astley and Henry Dean, the report proceeded to advert to the financial condition of the Society. Various donations having been referred to, it was stated that the Society had not recovered from the debt which, owing to increased expenditure, was contracted last year; and it was added, that the annual income was very inadequate for its extensive operations, and that the Committee had preferred not to trench upon the accumulated fund or to avoid useful expenditure. Solely on this ground, and upon the advice of the Finance Committee, the office of Home Agent and Missionary was designed to be abolished at Midsummer, 1856,—a circumstance which the Committee referred to with great regret, and which they coupled with an expression of the highest satisfaction at the results attained by the Rev. Hugh Hutton in the discharge of that office. The pecu-

niary grants of the year were next described, and a number of important and interesting reports were read from various localities to which pecuniary aid had been rendered. These reports were in the highest degree encouraging.

The Foreign department of the Association presented features of great interest. The circumstances connected with the departure of the Rev. J. C. Woods for Adelaide were alluded to, and the congregations of Melbourne and Sydney represented as in a very prosperous state. A large consignment of books and tracts had been made to the former.—The Committee continued to receive intelligence of the state and prospects of the congregation at Madras, and had thought it right to continue their grant of £30 to the mission, and had furnished Mr. Roberts with books and tracts to aid him in his ministry.

The operations of the Book and Tract department had even exceeded those of last year in magnitude. In various ways, no less than 27,345 books and tracts had been circulated. Frequent and gratifying testimonies of the good effected by this distribution had been received.

The Rev. HUGH HUTTON then read a report of the operations in which he had been engaged during the past year as Home Agent and Missionary to the Association. Amongst the subjects adverted to was the improved state of the Unitarian body in respect to its vacant pulpits. These vacancies had much decreased by the aid of the Association, the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, and Manchester New College, London. "I avail myself," says the report, "of this opportunity also, of bearing my most grateful testimony to the important assistance rendered towards the diminution of the evil of which we are speaking, though in no immediate connection with the operations of my mission, by the Principal, the Theological Professor, and the more advanced students of Manchester New College, London." After some description of particular operations of his mission, Mr. Hutton referred to a very important subject,—the necessity and duty of inquiring periodically into the condition, the terms, and the custodyship of the title-deeds of property and other trusts belonging to the various religious and charitable institutions with which they are connected. "Some properties," the report stated, "are said to



have been utterly lost to us, and appropriated to private purposes, owing in each case to the demise of the last Trustee and the absence of all well-advised and vigorous effort to secure them from spoliation. In other cases that have been represented to me, the properties do not seem to have been so completely directed from their original purpose, but, owing to the causes above stated, their management has fallen into hands which had no legal or moral right to assume such authority; and this has led to such jealousies and contentions among the members, as to promote the disruption, and even threaten the total annihilation of some congregations. I understand that, by recent alterations in the laws relative to Trusts, the renewal of trust-deeds, the appointment of trustees, and the recovery of property negligently or fraudulently misappropriated, are matters of comparatively easy and inexpensive arrangement. A portion of the funds of the Association has always been available to assist such objects, on a satisfactory representation of the facts of each case being submitted to the Committee."

As the whole of this and the Committee's report will shortly be distributed, we need not extract further portions of either. — The Treasurer's report, which was next read, shewed a deficiency of £165. 17s. 6d. This new debt is caused principally by the large and expensive operations of the Book and Tract department, many new tracts having been printed in large quantities for distribution. The income from subscriptions had increased from £615. 17s. to £659. 6s., and the donations amounted to £181. 16s. The pecuniary grants amounted to £209. 7s. 9d., besides £140 from the Cooke Fund.

The Rev. J. J. TAYLER, in moving the adoption of the report, confirmed the statement of Mr. Hutton as to the frequent neglect of trustees in allowing property to slip out of their hands, and suggested whether something might not be done to stimulate the different congregations throughout the country to a better organization of themselves, both spiritually and economically. He would also like to ask a question with regard to the projected translations of the Old Testament. He did not quite understand whether it was the intention of the Society to bring out an entire corrected version. Such a work, if adequately executed, would possess extreme value, but was a very great

undertaking, requiring the combined learning and abilities of first-rate men to perform it in a manner at all adequate to the importance of the object, or creditable to the body as a whole.

The Rev. THOMAS MADGE explained that it was not proposed to undertake the responsibility of a re-translation of any part, but to take existing translations, and endeavour to give at least something better than the common version. The only question was, whether the Association should wait from year to year and not satisfy the public demand.

Mr. TAYLER asked if it was proposed to substitute the new version for the old in public worship; and on receiving a reply in the negative, expressed himself satisfied, but intimated that it would be hardly creditable to the body to limit themselves to what was done by scholars fifty or sixty years ago.

Mr. MADGE said it was not pretended to issue a perfect translation, but only an improved one from existing sources.

The Rev. E. TAGART said that two plans had been before the Committee—one, the republication in a cheap form of existing translations, more or less approved, of various parts of the Old Testament, so as to put into the hands of the laity translations which would be useful to them; the other plan was, to republish a translation requiring the scholarship to which Mr. Tayler had alluded, based on the existing translations, with such alterations as would conform it to the present best received Hebrew text. This would be a work of years. But in the mean time, as the Committee had about £600 resulting from the Improved Version Fund, they thought it best to expend it in the republication of existing approved translations, reserving to themselves the performance of the larger work.

The Rev. W. J. ODGERS felt unwilling that the report should be adopted without the expression of regret at the probable retirement of Mr. Hutton from the office he held, and in which he had been extremely useful. If there were any gentleman present from America, he thought he would be prepared to tell them that one-half of the useful operation of the American Unitarian Association would cease, if they were to have no longer an agent doing the kind of work which Mr. Hutton had been doing, he thought, very efficiently, in this country.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Mr. Odgers should move a resolution on

the subject; and the report having been unanimously adopted, he accordingly proposed the resolution which will be found in our advertising pages. It was seconded by Mr. WATSON.

The Rev. F. BISHOP said it was well known that the labours of the Rev. C. Lincoln and the Rev. Dr. Miles had very much increased the usefulness of the American Association, and enlisted a much wider support of it from the Unitarian body scattered throughout America.

The Rev. W. H. CHANNING said there would be comparatively no living organization of the Unitarian body in America without the agency of the corresponding Secretary there, and he must say he heard the announcement of the discontinuance of Mr. Hutton's labours with entire surprise, not knowing the position of the Association in this country.

The resolution was then carried unanimously.

Mr. JAMES YATES had great pleasure in proposing a vote of thanks for the sermon they had the advantage of hearing that morning. He never heard a discourse more perfectly appropriate to the occasion. He had heard many which tended more to satisfy that inclination, which he thought very prevalent amongst us, to indulge in speculation and sentiments of a novel character—very interesting perhaps, very improving—perhaps adapted to excite intellectual activity, and so to gratify the propensity to which he thought we are very much prone; but that morning they had heard a most solid, impressive discourse on those views of the Christian religion which are the most important to our welfare here and hereafter. He remembered the former Secretary, and he might almost say the founder of this Association, Mr. Aspland, stating the Unitarian creed in a very few words. He said, "We believe in God as a Father, and in man as a brother." It was upon this sentiment that the preacher had enlarged, and they must all wish that feeling to be deeply impressed upon their minds.

The resolution having been passed unanimously, the Rev. G. B. BROCK briefly thanked the meeting.

The Rev. E. KELL moved a resolution thanking the retiring officers, and proposing those for the ensuing year, which was seconded by Mr. LUXMORE, and unanimously agreed to.

The Rev. E. TAGART proposed the next resolution, authorizing the Com-

mittee to apply the sum of £600 accruing from the sale of what is called an Improved Version of the New Testament, to the production and publication of an improved version of the Old. There was a reason why they should not continue to appropriate it to the republication of the present Improved Version of the New Testament. It was that in consequence of the labours of two excellent laymen connected with our body, Mr. Samuel Sharpe and the late Mr. Edgar Taylor, the taste for the Improved Version had somewhat subsided. He had no inclination to undervalue that Version; it will always have its value in our body by those who pay attention to the Scriptures.

Mr. YATES hoped it was clearly understood that the Trustees authorized the application of the Fund to the Old Testament.

Mr. TAGART said the Trustees did authorize that application; and after some further observations from Mr. Yates, the resolution was passed unanimously.

The Rev. H. SOLLY moved, and Mr. J. C. LAWRENCE seconded, a resolution expressing the strong disapprobation of the meeting at the continued violation of the fundamental principles of the British and Foreign School Society, as exhibited at the annual examination of the schools.

The proceedings of the business meeting were terminated by a vote of thanks to the Chairman; after which, the meeting adjourned to the Music Hall, Store Street, where about two hundred and fifty ladies and gentlemen sat down to a collation. The chair was again taken by Mr. Biggs, and addresses were delivered by the Revds. Ed. Tagart, J. J. Tayler, E. Kell, G. B. Brock, W. H. Channing, J. H. Allen and T. Madge, and by Mr. James Heywood, M.P., and Mr. W. Coffin, M.P. Our limited space will of course not allow of extracts from the excellent speeches delivered, reports of which have already appeared. We may remark, however, that the tone of the meeting was cheerful and full of hope. Special interest was excited by the presence of Revds. W. H. Channing, of Liverpool, and J. H. Allen, of Bangor, U.S. The following extract from Mr. Channing's speech is striking, as containing an American's view of the position of this country just at present:

"Nothing has delighted me so much since I have been in Great Britain, as the perfectly unflinching sincerity of

your self-criticism. I do not believe there is anything like it on the face of the earth. Somebody has said to me, 'Except in the United States.' I beg your pardon. It is my perfect conviction, that although in our childhood we can afford to find fault with the clothes that we are gradually outgrowing, it is not the man or the boy himself we find fault with. And you must allow me to say also, that I believe the reasons why you are so candid and sincere towards yourselves, is the indomitable faith you have that Great Britain has not accomplished her destiny, but is only rising to a higher position and a wider range; and, as the Spirit of Truth knows my heart, it is in no words of course or convention that I say I believe it fully. The only question is, whether all these great movements of the times shall be pervaded with that higher life which I am sure God is always ready to pour in—(applause). Now if there is anything which is to offer any explanation or apology for the candour with which we on all possible occasions endeavour to speak, it is the feeling that the present period, as viewed from abroad, is so solemn for Great Britain, for Christendom, and for the world—(hear, hear). Friends, I do wish that I could only shew you how the position of Great Britain looks to an American who really loves this nation—to one who feels that the freedom of our institutions, that what is strongest in our homes, and most manly and generous in our tone and character, has been derived from the very pulse-beats of this nation; because then you would see, that it is not only in her past and present, but also in her future aspect that we criticise her. We say that you are a boastful nation, perhaps a self-confident nation; but I do believe that Great Britain does not estimate her true power, nor recognize her true responsibility—for it seems to me as plain as the day, that not by human appointment but by Providential mission it is given to her to hold the balance of power in Christendom."

Mr. HERWOOD, M. P., in reply to the sentiment, "The cause of Education, freed from all ecclesiastical tests and sectarian limitations," and in reference to the opinion expressed by the Duke of Argyll at the last annual meeting of the British and Foreign School Society, that Trinitarian doctrines should be taught to all the children, because he believed those doctrines were found in

the Bible, said if that was the case, it was only an additional argument for a revision of the existing translation. With reference to the recent Act for the opening of the University of Oxford, it was found to be practically a farce; for it was left to the University to regulate all the internal arrangements for the admission of Dissenters, and if they did not sign the Thirty-nine Articles, matters were so arranged that they had no chance of preferment. He trusted that when the Cambridge Bill, which was already in the House of Lords, came into the House of Commons, an endeavour would be made to obtain something more substantial. He mentioned this subject, because he would not have the meeting suppose that they had to lay down their arms and say they had done quite enough, for there really was no reason to be satisfied as yet.

The Rev. THOMAS MADGE, in proposing a vote of thanks to the Chairman, referred with surprise and regret to the depreciatory manner in which Dr. Priestley had sometimes been spoken of in articles which had appeared in the *Inquirer* newspaper. He said—I refer more particularly to a paper to which was subjoined a name well known, but which I shall not now mention, and in which the writer, speaking of Dr. Priestley, says, that though his nature was essentially moral and heroic, it is a question whether he was deeply religious. Now, why such a question was made at all, I really cannot understand; for those who knew Dr. Priestley personally are ready to testify, and all who are well acquainted with his writings must have felt, that he was a deeply religious man—that he had the most entire trust and confidence in God, and in God's goodness and mercy—that the sense of an overruling Providence was ever present to his thoughts—that to the ways of that Providence, under circumstances the most trying, his submission was of a kind the most profound and even cheerful—and that his devotion was not a mere transient feeling, but was the habitual tone and temper of his mind. This writer also goes on to say that he was (I believe the expression is) far more of a scientific discoverer than a religious teacher. Now this, too, must have been said in the greatest ignorance of the man; for Dr. Priestley himself distinctly states that his philosophical pursuits were merely the employment and recreation



of his leisure hours, and that the greatest part of his time and attention was devoted to the investigation and promotion of Christian truth. I should also add, that as a religious teacher he was remarkable for his earnestness and diligence. This is evident from the instructions which he was in the habit of giving in the two congregations with which he was connected, at Leeds and Birmingham, to the younger members. This also may be seen from the work which he drew up and published expressly for their use and guidance. I mean "The Institutes of Religion," which deserves to be more known and read among us than it is. Invidious distinctions are sometimes made between Dr. Channing and Dr. Priestley. As a man and a Christian—as a lover of truth, of freedom, of virtue, of God and of his species—even Dr. Channing himself never stood upon higher ground than Dr. Priestley. And then again, I would ask, did ever any one give a more practical demonstration of a true Christian temper, of the way in which insults and injuries may be borne, than was given by Dr. Priestley in the midst of the bitter and unrelenting persecutions which he had to endure? And yet in the face of all this, it is asked whether Dr. Priestley was a deeply-religious man!

A hymn was then sung, and the proceedings terminated. The company was agreeably entertained at intervals during the afternoon by some very creditable glee singing, provided by Mr. S. W. New.

#### SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The twenty-first annual meeting and public breakfast of this Association was held on the Thursday morning in the Whitsun week, May 31st, at Radley's Hotel, Bridge Street, Blackfriars, and notwithstanding the weather was very unfavourable, was numerously attended. The chair was taken by the Rev. W. J. Odgers, of Bath, and the following gentlemen, among others, took part in the proceedings: Rev. Mr. Allen, of the United States, Revds. W. H. Channing, H. Solly, S. Martin, Davies, J. C. Means, H. Hutton, E. Kell, J. J. Tayler.

From the annual report, read by the Secretary, the Rev. William Vidler, we make the following extracts:

"In the last annual report, the small amount of the annual sale of publications as compared to what might fairly be considered to be the demand from the size

and number of the schools, was noticed with regret. Without at all wishing to interfere with the undoubted right which the managers of the schools have to select from any quarter the books which they think most suitable for their purpose, it was then suggested that, other things being equal, they should give a preference to the publications of their own Association. It might appear that this suggestion had been carried out to some extent, for the amount received on account of sales shews a large increase. It stands thus: Amount received on account of sale of publications in 1853, £57. 13s. 10d.; ditto, 1854, £89. 4s. 4d., or an increase in the year 1854 of £31. 10s. 6d.; but much of this, if not all, is made up by the addition received on the sale of the Sunday Reading Book, which, now that the schools are mostly supplied, is likely to be but small in the current year. The sale of the Sunday-School Hymn-Book continues to be the most regular and largest of all the publications of the Association.

"Your Committee cannot but notice with apprehension that the annual subscriptions were £16. 4s. less last year than the preceding one, while the donations were very trifling, being only £1. 2s. Scattered as the subscribers to this Association are throughout the country, there will always be some difficulty in the collection, and many of the subscriptions in arrear it is hoped may yet be paid; but it cannot be too strongly impressed on the friends of the Association that the main support of such Societies must always depend on the regularity of the annual subscriptions.

"In the 74 schools in connection with the Association, there are 8,880 children, and 1503 teachers; in the 39 schools not in connection with the Association, there are 3,380 children, and 526 teachers. Most of the schools have connected institutions which must prove very serviceable, such as week-evening classes, libraries, sick societies, saving and burial funds. 29 schools made returns last year and have not done so this. In these schools there were then 4207 children, and 698 teachers. If it be assumed that upon the whole these schools have not fallen off within the year, and these numbers are added to those of the preceding schools, the gross total of the 142 schools would be, 16,467 children, and 2729 teachers, leaving 35 schools of which the existence is known, but from which there are no numerical returns. The summary of last year, taken in the same way, was 18,430 children, and 2791 teachers. That of the present year shews a decrease of 1963 children, and a decrease of 64 teachers."

## CHRISTIAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The forty-sixth anniversary of this Society was held at Radley's Hotel, London, on May 31st,—the Treasurer, James Esdaile, Esq., in the chair. Circumstances connected with the Society gave to this meeting more than usual interest. The Committee, after mature deliberation, had considered it incumbent upon them during the spring to make an appeal to the public, setting forth the claims of this Society, explaining the position in which it stood, and openly putting the question, "Is it to be supported, or must it be dissolved?" That question it was for the annual meeting to decide, and in consequence a much larger number than usual attended. In the report presented by the Committee, allusion of course was made to the Appeal and its results, which were stated to be of a satisfactory nature, several donations and subscriptions having been received, and more promised if the Society continued in existence. Many valuable suggestions were offered by letter and by those present at the meeting; and, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee, a resolution for the continuance of the Society was unanimously adopted.

The Society was founded in 1809, its object being the printing and circulating of small cheap tracts inculcating moral conduct on Christian principles. That object has been carefully observed, and to the whole number of tracts now issued confident appeal may be made.

It is not only pecuniary support for which the Committee have made their Appeal; they would rejoice if new channels were found for the circulation of their tracts. Could not many, if not all, of our congregations establish a Tract institution for lending or giving to the poor? Support of this nature has been kindly promised by several ministers, and if it were generally carried out, great and lasting good would be the result.

The Secretary, Mr. Clennell, London Fields, Hackney, will gladly receive any communications in reference to the Society, or forward a Catalogue of its publications, or a copy of the last Report, to any person desirous of further information.

## MIDLAND UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of Ministers for the Midland District, and of the Sunday-school Association, was held on

Wednesday and Thursday, June 20 and 21. The ministers present were, Revds. Thos. Hincks, Sheffield; A. T. Blythe, Chesterfield; Dr. Hutton, Derby; W. Sutherland, Flagg; E. O. Jones, Duffield; T. C. Holland, Loughborough; C. Berry, Leicester; Joseph Dare, Leicester; J. G. Teggin, Mansfield; C. C. Nutter, Lincoln; and B. Carpenter, Nottingham.

There was a religious service on Wednesday evening in the High-Pavement chapel, conducted by the Revds. Wm. Sutherland and Thomas Hincks, who preached from Luke xi. 13, on the influences of the Spirit, in which, in an able and interesting manner, he explained the nature of the doctrine, vindicated it from objections, shewed its importance on our spiritual life, and the inspiring and consoling effects of a devout and holy communion of our minds with the Supreme Mind. He then remarked on the neglect into which, from a too antagonistic point of view, the doctrine had fallen amongst us; but such was its congeniality with the wants and feelings of our religious nature, that even the common, though erroneous, doctrine of the personality of the Holy Ghost had had its use in impressing more firmly on the common mind, by means of an objective form, the reality and value of that devout intercourse with the Father of our spirits, after which our souls, in their highest and best state, so earnestly seek and aspire.

On Thursday morning, the service was conducted by the Revds. Dr. Hutton and A. T. Blythe, who from Gal. v. 5, ably pointed out the importance of the position now occupied by Unitarian Christians from the unfettered liberty of thought and inquiry enjoyed by them: he then shewed the advantages and obligations thence arising, but dwelt more especially on the latter, and enforced the duty of all to profess and act up to their sincere and deliberate convictions of Christian truth, without fear or favour. In this way should we best make our opinions tell on the various religious parties around us, and, by promoting the holy cause of that liberty with which Christ has made us free, tend to make us, if not all of one mind in opinion, at least more and more all of one heart in spirit and love.

In the afternoon of the same day, the annual meeting of the Midland Sunday-school Association was held in the girls' school-room at four o'clock, William

Enfield, Esq., President, in the chair. Delegates were present from Sheffield, Chesterfield, Derby, Loughborough, Leicester and Nottingham, who gave in reports of the state and prospects of their several schools; in the course of which some very interesting and useful conversation arose: various practical suggestions were made respecting a better supply of teachers, and on the importance of giving secular instruction on the week evenings, in order that the Sunday might be more devoted to religious teaching chiefly or solely, with other topics of equal interest. The reports of the Committee appointed to visit the various schools of the Association during the year were then received, and the officers and committees for the ensuing year were all re-appointed; which, with the Treasurer's account by Mr. Charles Perry, concluded the business of the meeting.

An adjournment then took place to the lower school-room, where a large general meeting was assembled, consisting of the ministers, delegates and members of the High-Pavement chapel.

After tea, the chair was occupied by the Rev. B. Carpenter, and the proceedings of the evening commenced with singing a hymn. The Chairman then briefly explained the objects of the Association; and after having noticed the changes that had taken place in the ministers' district by removals, sickness or death,\* since they last met together in that room on a similar occasion six years ago, called upon Mr. W. Enfield to express the thanks of the meeting to the Rev. Thomas Hincks for his excellent discourse the evening before, with best wishes for his increased usefulness and happiness on his approaching removal to Leeds.

The Rev. gentleman, in his acknowledgment, introduced some very useful and pertinent remarks on Sunday-schools in connection with the Association; on their great importance, their right working, the opportunities afforded by them of bringing out in various ways the different energies of a Christian church, and the best means to be adopted by which they might be made to feed the church in return, and to increase its activity and extension by attaching the elder scholars and teachers unto it.

A similar expression of thanks was moved by Mr. Eames to the Rev. A. T. Blythe for his able discourse in the morning, with cordial desires for his health and strength on resuming the work of the ministry. This gave rise to some interesting and valuable remarks on both sides, connected with the subject of the discourse.

Mr. S. Hollins, in a few appropriate expressions, then conveyed to Dr. Hutton, who had conducted the devotional service, our ancient friend and now near neighbour, the cordial wishes of the meeting that the communication between the congregations of Derby and Nottingham may continually increase and benefit both. Dr. Hutton then alluded in a feeling manner to the times long gone by, when he was one of the ministers of the chapel, and the colleague of one of the most excellent, upright and conscientious of men, the late Rev. James Tayler.

Mr. J. Perry, in a very suitable manner, then connected with the Rev. W. Sutherland, "Success to the cause of all missionary efforts to spread the knowledge of the everlasting Gospel, both at home and abroad." And Mr. Sutherland bore an excellent and honourable testimony to the Wesleyan Methodists, among whom he had been brought up, and to whom he owed unspeakable obligations for his religious training, though he now differed from them, and was after many a struggle obliged to separate himself from them.

Mr. H. M. Wood, as one of the oldest members of the congregation present, then moved, in a feeling and interesting manner, "That the sincere and cordial tribute of our esteem and respect be rendered to one who has borne the heat and burden of the day through a long, useful and successful ministry, with best wishes for his health and happiness—the Rev. Chas. Berry, of Leicester." This was well seconded by Mr. Shaw, another old and valued member of the congregation, and warmly received by the meeting.

Mr. Berry, in his usual happy manner of expressing his thanks, referred to the commencement of his ministry at Leicester, and his pleasant intercourse with Nottingham and its ministers, especially the Rev. James Tayler. He then spoke in cheerful terms of the present state of his congregation, and also of his chapel, lately improved and decorated in its interior; and then concluded with his hearty good wishes towards the Nottingham congregation,

---

\* The Rev. P. Wright, of Stannington, to whom the Chairman offered the tribute of his esteem and friendship.



its chapel, and the different institutions therewith connected.

The last subject, introduced by the Rev. T. Hincks, was "Success to the Midland Sunday-school Association; and may the objects of its establishment, viz., to encourage and assist the Sunday-schools in connection with it, and to promote union and co-operation among their teachers and friends, be abundantly answered."

This gave rise to some further observations on the subject, in which the Chairman, Dr. Hutton, Rev. T. Hincks, and Messrs. W. Enfield and Vickers, of Stanington, joined. The business was interspersed with some excellent pieces by the singing class. The Rev. C. C. Nutter then proposed thanks to the Chairman; and with a hymn and benediction the proceedings of this pleasant evening were brought to a close.

#### WEST-RIDING TRACT SOCIETY.

The 40th anniversary of this Yorkshire Association was held at Huddersfield on Wednesday, the 20th of June. The fineness of the day brought together a numerous and highly respectable assembly. There were friends from Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield, Sheffield, Lydgate, York, Dewsbury, Halifax, &c. Amongst the ministers were Rev. Thomas Madge, of London, Rev. John Kenrick, Rev. E. Higginson, Rev. J. H. Ryland, Rev. H. V. Palmer, Rev. P. Cannon, Rev. J. Owen, Rev. J. K. Montgomery, Rev. E. Hall, Rev. J. S. Gilbert, Rev. J. J. Bishop and Rev. R. B. Aspland. The religious service was held in the beautiful "Unitarian Church" recently opened by the Huddersfield congregation. Both it and the school-room below are now finished and handsomely fitted up, and in their completed state excited the warm admiration of visitors. Protesting, as we shall continue to do, against the propriety of putting any school into the situation of a cellar, under another building, we must admit that in the school-room at Huddersfield the obvious inconveniences of such a practice are as much obviated and lessened as possible. The rooms are light and airy. They are, by means of woollen cloth hangings, capable of being, when required, divided into several distinct rooms, for boys and girls, or for junior and senior classes. These hangings are easily drawn aside, and then a spacious room exists, fitted up with a pulpit, presenting many capabilities for public,

devotional or social meetings.—The devotional services were conducted by Rev. H. V. Palmer, of York. The sermon was preached by Rev. T. Madge. Taking for his text Ezekiel xviii. 29, "O house of Israel, are not my ways equal?" the preacher observed that the rational and moral nature of man is constantly appealed to in vindication of the ways of God. He shewed the propriety of this, and, with equal logical power and nice discrimination, vindicated the use of reason in the province of religion. He glanced briefly, but powerfully, at the moral argument against Calvinism, from its repugnance to the reason and the moral sense implanted by the Creator in the mind of man. He dwelt upon the necessity and advantage of a religious system which carried with it the concurrence of the intellect and the moral sense. By a few brief but remarkable quotations from John Wesley and Bishops Heber and Jeremy Taylor, he shewed that others besides Unitarians recognize and act upon these principles. Of the close chain of reasoning which characterized the whole discourse, and the simple power and beauty of diction in which the preacher clothed his thoughts, nothing but a word-for-word report would give our readers an adequate conception. And a verbal report could convey no adequate impression of the force of elocution and silvery sweetness of voice with which (notwithstanding Mr. M.'s indisposition) the whole was uttered. Well pleased shall we be if the future publication of this sermon gives us the opportunity of again dilating upon its merits.

At the close of the religious service, the congregation remaining in the church formed themselves into the business meeting of the West-Riding Tract Society and Village Mission. Rev. John Kenrick was called to the chair. The report was read by Rev. E. Higginson, the indefatigable Secretary. It stated that it was just forty years this month since the Society originated. Its formation was agreed upon at the annual meeting of the "Association of Protestant Dissenting Ministers in the West-Riding, of the denomination commonly called Presbyterian," which was held at Leeds, June 8, 1815. Its declared purpose was the distribution of tracts. The Rules were drawn up by Rev. Henry Turner, and were afterwards adopted at Elland, at a meeting on the occasion of the settlement there of Rev. John Beattie. The

original objects of the Society were now enlarged by the establishment of a Mission, which demands the larger amount of the Society's attention and means. After shewing the usefulness of the Tract department, the report specified the calls made upon the Society for books and tracts during the past year, amounting in number to 3460, and in cost to £55. The principal demand was from Huddersfield, Wakefield, Thorne, Bradford and Halifax. Grants for distribution had been made by the Committee to Lydgate and Holmfirth, Huddersfield and Idle, and nearly 500 works had been distributed by the Society's missionary.

In respect to the Mission, the report stated in terms of regret, honourable to the person concerned, the resignation of Mr. Moon, consequent on his settling at Stannington as minister of the congregation in that place, and successor of the late Rev. Peter Wright. The Committee believe that Mr. Moon has, with considerable judgment and success, aimed at introducing a more pre-eminently religious and devotional tone into the Sunday meetings of that class of persons who, since their revolt from orthodoxy, and under the solicitation and guidance of that vague style of popular teaching and preaching which prevails among their native speakers, have been accustomed to welcome with equal readiness a lecture on poetry, politics, or the gospel, as their Sunday's "service." The improved position of the congregation at Pudsey justified the concentration, encouraged by the Committee, of the labours of the missionary upon a few principal stations. This society has recently obtained a much improved place of worship, with the additional recommendation of its being so situated as to suit the Unitarians of Stanningley. The report detailed the steps taken by the Committee to procure a successor to Mr. Moon. A temporary engagement had been made with Mr. Gilbert. In respect to some of the candidates who had appeared for the office, the Committee expressed its surprise at the crude and immature state of religious thought and biblical attainment exhibited. Some of them, apparently urged by vague ideas of promoting popular knowledge and general improvement, or accustomed to speak at Temperance meetings, or to lecture on general topics, had evidently not appreciated the special object of the Mission, which is distinctly to present Unitarian Chris-

tianity to the acceptance of thoughtful and earnest minds which have revolted from an irrational Orthodoxy and are solicited by a gross Secularism. Passing and commendatory allusion was made in the report to the Manchester Home Missionary Board. The Committee dwelt with some anxiety on the financial position of the Society. There was work for several missionaries, but at present their resources were scarcely adequate for the support of one. The balance against the Society had increased during the year, and unless a rally was made there would be a large balance against it next year. Offers of subscriptions had been made (two of £20), if a mission could be established at other places. Hitherto the Committee were unable to act on these liberal offers. In order to recruit the funds, the Committee had requested the local Treasurers to make arrangements for a series of congregational collections. Hitherto the only result was from Wakefield; but collections had been promised at Leeds, Halifax and Lydgate. The report concluded with a statement of the circumstances which had led to the meeting being held at Huddersfield instead of York, and with an expression of respectful and cordial sympathy with the venerable Rev. C. Wellbeloved, whose illness prevented him from welcoming the Society on this occasion to the metropolitan city of the province.

Mr. Briggs read the Treasurer's report, which shewed an expenditure for the year of £197, against receipts of £176, leaving a balance due to the Treasurer of £21. He feared there would, at the end of next year, be a balance against the Society of £50, unless remedial steps were immediately taken.

Mr. Moon's report was next read. It exhibited three preaching stations, and five lay preachers engaged in the work. Stanningley was no longer a station of the Mission, but many of the Unitarians of that place attend at Pudsey. The latter is a very promising station. A new preaching-room had been obtained and furnished during the year, and an active and intelligent congregation had been brought together. During the winter months, Mr. Moon delivered a Sunday-evening series of religious biographical lectures, which had been numerous attended and had removed from many minds pre-existing prejudices. A Sunday-morning class for adults has been in operation for two

years and more, and a Sunday-school will soon be established. A better organization of the Society has been effected, and a subscription list has been formed. In Mr. Moon's estimation, the Pudsey station never possessed such elements of health, promise, respectability and growth, as at the present time.—At Windhill-Crag station, there is a Sunday-school attended by about forty-five pupils. Much improvement has taken place in the intelligent and zealous teachers who conduct the school. Owing to religious bigotry, the religious services have not been well attended. Individuals attending have been marked, and have received from orthodox employers significant hints of a character that have induced them to absent themselves.—At Armley, the cottage service has been discontinued; but an offer had just been made by the Temperance Society of the place, to open its rooms for the preachers of the Society.

Upon the motion of Mr. England, of Huddersfield, seconded by Mr. Jackson, of Leeds, the reports were adopted and ordered to be printed.

Various books and tracts were then ordered, on the motion of Rev. J. H. Ryland, to be added to the catalogue; amongst which were Mr. Higginson's *Astro-theology*, *Spirit of the Bible*, and single Sermons published during the year; Mr. Kell's *Anti-war Sermon*; Mr. Martineau's *Huddersfield Sermon*, and various other English and American publications.

In moving a vote of thanks to the Secretary and other officers for their various services so efficiently rendered, Mr. Todd, of Dewsbury, expressed his great regret that there should be any deficiency of funds, and hoped the required exertions would be made at other places besides Wakefield. For his own part, in addition to his existing subscription, he was willing to give £10 per annum towards the establishment of a second Mission.—The Secretary stated that the offer of Mr. Todd was the more handsome, inasmuch as he and his family had this year doubled their subscriptions to the Society.

After some other routine resolutions were passed, it was observed that the hour appointed for the public collation had arrived. The meeting therefore adjourned to the spacious hotel adjoining to the railway station. A large company, consisting in about equal proportions of ladies and gentlemen, sat down to an elegant *déjeuner*. The

chair was taken by Mr. Alderman Richard Solly, of Sheffield, who, on opening the proceedings, expressed his attachment to the West-Riding, and his respect for the Tract and Mission Society and the Huddersfield congregation and its minister, and gave in succession the usual sentiments of "The Queen," and "Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over;" being reminded that it was the anniversary of the Queen's accession, and observing that we could not better celebrate it than by promoting the education of her subjects in the way that approved itself to our consciences and hearts; observing likewise on the especial obligations civil and religious liberty owed to Protestant Dissenters.

The Vice-president, Mr. England, of Huddersfield, gave the next sentiment, viz., "Our thanks to Mr. Madge for his able and interesting sermon," remarking that it was particularly interesting to himself, as one who had passed through the change from other views. He hoped it would be printed.

Rev. John Kenrick seconded the proposal. He had listened with very great delight to Mr. Madge's sermon, not only so eloquent in itself, but so remarkably seasonable in the topics which were handled. Looking back on his friend's past life, it seemed that, instead of his fire burning out as he grew older, it burnt brighter, and gave out a more genial heat with every added year of his life, and long might it continue to be the case.

Rev. Thomas Madge expressed his thanks for the very kind way in which his name had been mentioned and his services received. He thought the cause which brought the company together deserved and demanded our warmest sympathy and support. While views of Christianity repugnant to reason and conscience continued to prevail and to multiply unbelievers around us, he could not believe that the time was come for us to cease to combat such views. Truth, though omnipotent, was so through human exertions. Nor, on the wide and comprehensive ground of the edifice of our faith, could we be justly accused of indulging in a narrow sectarianism. Union among Christians was most desirable, but chimerical without catholic principles and a comprehensive creed. It could be only on the ground of a common Christianity, and that would be found to be precisely Unitarian Christianity.

The Chairman, in proposing "The



West-Riding Unitarian Tract and Mission Society," observed on the error of placing religion on a level with other educational and social objects, while it ought to be far above them in its claims on our zeal, liberality and support.

Rev. E. Higginson, the Secretary, responded; and, after some general observations, mentioned the Unitarian congregation arising out of a society of Christian Brethren at Sowerby Bridge, respecting which he had received an interesting letter from Rev. B. Herford, of Todmorden. He then entered into details of the West-Riding Tract and Mission Society's operations, and earnestly commended it to enlarged support.

Mr. Todd, of Dewsbury, was then called upon to propose a resolution to the effect that it was indispensable to the continued success of the Mission to increase its reliable annual funds, and that congregational collections, as one mode of doing so, be made in the district within the next twelve months. He quite believed that though a great proportion of working men never went to a place of worship, yet, were the pure gospel preached to them, they would accept it. While he advised congregational collections for the Mission, larger sums were required, as £5 or £10 a-year, from the wealthier members.

H. C. Briggs, Esq., as Treasurer, seconded the motion, being persuaded, however, that increased annual subscriptions were the more reliable source of income.

The Secretary then proposed the recognition of our obligations to the Missionary, the Rev. M. A. Moon, and his coadjutors. Mr. Moon's services had been highly valued, and the loss of them was proportionately regretted.

The sentiment, in the absence of Mr. Moon, called up Rev. J. S. Gilbert (who had taken Mr. Moon's place for the last few weeks) and Mr. Yelland. They were followed by the Rev. J. J. Bishop (at present assisting the Rev. J. Barling at Halifax), and Rev. Edward Hall, of the Leeds Domestic Mission.

Rev. John Owen, of Lydgate, then proposed a recognition of the welcome which the Huddersfield congregation had given the members of the Tract and Mission Society from various places that day; a sentiment which the Rev. Thomas Madge re-echoed, observing that the pleasure he had anticipated from his visit had been far exceeded.

Mr. England, on behalf of the Huddersfield society, acknowledged the sentiment in appropriate terms.

Rev. J. H. Ryland, adverting to the losses which the West-Riding had sustained, proposed the welcome of the Society to Rev. Thomas Hincks, as minister-elect of Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, prevented by engagement at the annual meeting in the district he was leaving, from being present at theirs.

The Chairman deplored the loss of Mr. Hincks at Sheffield, and fully assented to what Mr. Ryland had said; and yielding his office to the Rev. John Kenrick, the Rev. P. Cannon proposed, and Rev. J. K. Montgomery seconded, the thanks of the company to Mr. Solly for his kindness in coming from Sheffield to take the chair, and for the great ability with which he had discharged its duties. Mr. Montgomery expressed his pleasure in meetings like this, as leading to a closer bond of union both between churches and members of churches. He mentioned also the intended print of the beautiful edifice which he has himself been so greatly instrumental in raising, and now known as the Fitzwilliam-Street church, Huddersfield.

The desire to see Mr. Madge's sermon in print was expressed by several of the speakers, and the Committee assembling at the close of the meeting to make arrangements for Mr. Moon's successor, made a unanimous request to Mr. Madge to put it into their hands.

Mr. Todd's offer at the morning meeting of £10 additional subscription, is one of four such that have been made at and since the last annual meeting of the Society, and the Chairman of the day handsomely presented a donation of two guineas to its funds.

---

EASTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN SOCIETY.

The forty-second anniversary of this Society was held at the Octagon chapel, Norwich, on Thursday, June 21st. The service was introduced in an impressive manner by the Rev. Henry Squire, of Yarmouth; and the Rev. Charles Clarke, of Birmingham, preached a thoughtful and earnest discourse from the words, "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth" (1 Sam. iii. 9). The preacher began by observing that Divine Wisdom could make any individual the instrument of its power and grace; and in this case it was a little child who heard the heavenly voice. Childhood was favoured by God. He proceeded to explain what he re-

garded as the proper function of the Bible. Learned men, geologists and others, had spent much time and pains in trying to make the book of Genesis speak the science of the 19th century. This was useless so long as it remained evident that God could teach moral without teaching scientific truth. We did not want the Bible to instruct us in astronomy, geology or anatomy, but to inspire us with faith in the living God. And the histories of those ancient men—Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Samuel—were precisely adapted to this purpose. They shewed us God acting with and for men. The devotional books of the Old Testament also—the Psalms, Job, the Prophets—were all filled with this spirit; they were interpenetrated with the thought of God. In this their value consisted. They brought home to us, as no other writings did, the profound and irresistible feeling that this world is governed by a great and wise Being. For this reason, we must pronounce the Bible the greatest of all books. The preacher then addressed himself to elucidate his text. God speaks now, if not audibly, yet as really as he spake of old. We are as much as ever under his care and inspection; and the feeling of the Divine presence immediately inspiring and animating us is the real root of religious faith and life. 1st. God speaks through all great and good men, through prophets, and especially through Christ. He sends forth noble, heroic men to elevate and inspire us. All history shews that, without such lofty characters, the tendency of man is not to ascend, but to descend in the scale. We cannot raise ourselves by mere volition, but require a vision of higher goodness to be placed before us; and the strong must sacrifice themselves, that the weak may be lifted up. The life of Christ was an exhibition of this heroic self-sacrifice; its influence has been acting on the world for eighteen centuries, and must endure while the world lasts. 2ndly. God speaks through the particular circumstances of our lot. There is a work marked out for every one; each age has its task. We shall not readily believe in chance when we see that every creature has its place in the universe. The present state of the nations, the events that are going on around us, are suited to our special gifts; they make their appeal to us, and that appeal must be met. 3rdly. God speaks through conscience and all our affections of good. We treat our best and greatest thoughts very badly; instead of cherishing, we

reject them; instead of regarding them as the pure, unchanging lights of heaven put forth for our guidance, we too often look upon them as the misleading meteors of earth. In our abhorrence of the false and base, in our sympathy for the great and true, in our love of all that is fair and good, God speaks—and woe to us if we neglect those heavenly voices! Lastly, what does God say? Through Christ and all good men he says, Strive to benefit and bless your brother—help the weaker, as the stronger have helped you. Through events God says, Let each hour be graced by the act suitable to it—perform your work in due season—sow in the morn your seed; there is one coming in the evening to reap. Through conscience he says, Make your thought a deed—be true to your own nature—live out your highest convictions—consecrate your heart to goodness, and lean upon God. We shall be successful, both as individuals and as a church, in proportion as we hear this appeal and obey like the faithful men of old.

After service, Thomas Lombe Taylor, Esq., of Starston, being called to the chair, the business of the Society was transacted. From the Secretary's report it appeared that the churches of the district, with their connected institutions, were in a healthy state, and had maintained their efficiency during the past year. The pulpit of Ipswich, vacant by the removal of Rev. Henry Knott to Plymouth, had not yet been filled up. A proposition was made and carried that, in order to extend the basis of the Society and interest a greater number of persons, the minimum subscription be lowered from 5s. to 1s.

In the afternoon, upwards of a hundred ladies and gentlemen sat down to a cold collation at the Royal Hotel. The chair was very ably filled by Professor TAYLOR, of Gresham College, London, whose pleasant and appropriate observations in introducing the various topics contributed greatly to the enjoyment of the evening. He referred to his former connection with Norwich, and to the formation of the Eastern Unitarian Society in 1813. At that time the ministers and congregations of the district were almost entirely unknown to each other. This Society was formed to bring them into closer connection, to promote exchanges of pulpits and pews, of courtesies and hospitalities; and it had been very successful. Its principles were Unitarian, and therefore in favour of civil and religious liberty. For indeed he knew of no other religious body who had consistently sup-

ported this principle throughout. The Church of England certainly persecuted where it could; as to the Roman Catholics, fire and faggot was almost a part of their creed; the Wesleyans had embodied in their Conference some of the worst features of priestcraft; and the orthodox Dissenters had given us a sample of their illiberal spirit when they wanted to take our chapel endowments from us. But the Unitarian body had been marked for its adherence to freedom and the rights of conscience; and whether it were the Jews, Catholics, Dissenters or even Unbelievers that were oppressed on account of their opinions, we had ever stood manfully forward in their behalf.

MR. MOTTRAM, in replying to the sentiment of Civil and Religious Liberty, compared the present with the former state of things. He referred to the efforts of the Chairman, who had certainly been a pioneer in this cause. He traced the progress of liberal sentiment, and of opinions which it was no disgrace now to avow, but which were once accounted most dangerous and dreadful.

REV. HENRY SQUIRE responded to the Memory of the Two Thousand. It would ill become an assembly of English Presbyterians to pass over that grand and signal tribute which our fathers paid to the rights of conscience. Theirs was no trivial act, but a sacrifice as great as it was rare. They had to sever some of the tenderest ties, and go forth from honour and wealth to reproach and poverty. Yet it was such a prompt obedience to duty, such a noble and disinterested step, that he thought the memory of it would never be lost from our hearts. Such men were our examples; and he sincerely wished that the children might not prove unworthy of their fathers.

REV. W. SELBY, of Hapton, spoke briefly in reference to the progress of Unitarian principles. He believed he was called an incorrigible Unitarian. He was getting old and feeble now, but whatever there was of good, of sound, of true about him, was Unitarian and nothing else. There was a desponding tone taken by some which he could not approve of; the *Inquirer* was filled with letters which implied that we were sinking fast. Such was not the fact. So far as he saw, both the Church and Dissenters were adopting our views. We might not be increasing much as a body, but no one could doubt that our principles were spreading. They were the principles of Christ and his apostles, and

no power on earth could overthrow the revelation of God.

J. W. DOWSON, Esq., thought that we had great principles of freedom and faith, but we must make them bring forth fruit. He referred to the missionary objects of the Society. It was very desirable to have the subscription lowered, and he confidently anticipated that we might increase our number three or even ten-fold. Other sects had real liberty as well as ourselves; he might instance the Wesleyan Reformers. There was great zeal and activity amongst them, and we might rival or even surpass them. Wherever it was practicable to establish a Sunday-school, or a church in one's "own house," it ought to be done. He regretted the disputes and divisions that had broken up the church of Christ, and wished to encourage among all sects a spirit of union and co-operation.

REV. CHARLES CLARKE said he was always glad to meet with Unitarian friends. He had found in this religious body more opportunities of usefulness, and a far greater amount of liberty, than he believed he could have found anywhere else. Some of our friends were given to complaint; they seemed to be deeply conscious of their own defects. This shewed at least that they possessed the Christian grace of humility. If Unitarianism was really dying, he had no time to waste upon it; for this was a most real world in which we were placed,—full of living interests. But so far from allowing this, he held that the field of work was opening out for us, and our principles were gaining strength every day. Unitarianism had hitherto, perhaps, received too narrow an interpretation. To his mind it stood for two things,—correct relations to Man and to God. It stands first for the sacredness of conscience; that we are responsible to God and not to man for our opinions; the right of the human soul to worship God according to its own highest convictions. Without this there could be no pure religion, no free-will offering to the Great Father of all. It stands, secondly, for correct notions of God. He is a Father; in wisdom, in power, in goodness, He is all that we can desire or even conceive. There is nothing in our views that strikes cold upon the heart, and makes us recoil from God. For this our faith was to be loved and honoured. And the history of its noble confessors was in accordance with this. Some of his predecessors in Birmingham had been men of the highest character, of the most pure and devoted life. But



we must not rest upon the deeds of our forefathers, but strive to do the duty of our own time. He believed there was a great future for our principles, and if we declined the obligation to carry them out, the work would be done by others. If we feel that our body is decaying, that our church is in danger, our duty is not to leave it, but to breathe what we can of truth and power into it.

Rev. D. DAVIS, of Norwich, said that he must also look upon himself as an unworthy successor of some of the noblest of men. When he looked back, he felt that "there were giants in those days." They had laboured, we enter into their labours, and should preserve their inheritance. He believed also that our faith had an important work before it. Truth might be found in the bottom of the well, but it could not lie for ever there. This was a disturbed and chaotic time; innumerable opinions were afloat; the most various and opposite tendencies were visible in the religious world. The Church of England was divided against itself; some were going over to Romanism, and many, he feared, to Scepticism. Our church was exceedingly important, for it occupied that middle position which reconciled faith and reason, nature and revelation. If we were faithful to our principles, he predicted the happiest results.

Rev. S. F. MACDONALD, of Diss, thought there were greater signs of union amongst us than at any former period. The distinction between old and new-school Unitarian was passing away. We were all drawing nearer each other, and understanding each other better. At the same time, we must not think of being all "of one mind." That, in fact, would be a stagnant and undesirable state. Difference was a sign of freedom, a sign of thought. The conservative party, whether in religion or politics, might stand together because of its greater timidity, ignorance or inertness; but the liberals were always found to be divided. They were split up into sects and sub-sects, but still they had principles in common. A great deal had been said lately about sectarianism and its evil effects. If sectarianism meant—as he thought it could only mean—having clear and defined views, distinct principles of action, there was no evil in it. The philosopher has definite principles of philosophy, the politician of politics,—why not the religious man of religion? We must all have a creed either expressed or understood. The evil of sectarianism lay not in having definite

views, but in assuming those views to be infallible, and condemning all who did not agree with us. All that any man ought to say is, "I think I am right;" when the "I think" changes into the "I know," and the usual deduction follows, "therefore you are wrong and must perish,"—the cruel logic of persecution is begun. So long as we held our special opinions charitably, with the consciousness of fallibility, no harm was done. We should remember that we were all students together of God's word and works, and simply strive to study them reverently and earnestly. He emphatically denied that the Unitarians were a modern sect, the upstart product of the eighteenth or nineteenth century. We could trace our principles along the stream of Christian history; we maintained and were prepared to prove that they formed in substance the simple, original, apostolical Christianity.

Rev. T. COOPER, of Framlingham, regarded the signs of the times as cheering, and could see no reason to despond. He knew several among the Wesleys and other bodies who were breaking away from orthodoxy; Calvinism was at a discount; and so far as he could perceive, Unitarianism was the only "ism" that was increasing. Two new chapels would be opened within the year in London, and for himself he thanked God and took courage.

In the course of the day reference was made to the centenary meeting which it is proposed to hold next year to celebrate the opening of the Octagon chapel on the 12th of May, 1756.

At the close of the proceedings the company adjourned to the house of Horatio Bolingbroke, Esq., where they were most kindly and hospitably entertained. The band of the Brotherly Society was in attendance, and played several beautiful airs during the evening. Friends gathered from a distance had the opportunity of exchanging thoughts and courtesies, and all agreed that they had rarely held a more pleasant or profitable gathering.

---

#### THE PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY.

This ancient annual gathering of Presbyterian and Unitarian ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire, met on Thursday, June 21, at Renshaw-Street chapel, Liverpool. Unusually large and liberal preparations for the reception and hospitable entertainment of the ministers and friends, were made by the two congregations of Hope Street and Renshaw

Street. A committee was formed, by whom all the necessary arrangements were made; and the result of their forethought and judgment, seconded by the hospitality and zeal of the Unitarians of Liverpool, was a remarkably successful and agreeable meeting, the recollection of which will be long gratefully cherished by those in whose honour the preparations were made. Unusual interest was given to the meeting by the circumstance that the chapel at which the religious service was appointed to be held, was that at which an American minister was now temporarily ministering, and he bearing the honoured name of Channing. A large and highly respectable congregation assembled soon after eleven o'clock. The devotional portion of the service was impressively conducted by Rev. T. E. Poynting, of Monton. The united chapel choirs of Hope Street and Renshaw Street led with good effect the psalmody. Before the sermon, a fine anthem, by Webbe, set to the beautiful Unitarian hymn composed by the late W. Roscoe, Esq., was sung. It was at this chapel that this distinguished man was wont to worship. This is the hymn:

Holy, holy, holy  
Lord God Almighty!  
Thou to whom alone are  
All praise and glory due!

Holy, holy, holy  
Lord God Almighty!  
Father everlasting!  
Righteous, just, and true!

Bending down before thee,  
Lo! thy sons adore thee,  
Hand and voice declaring  
JEHOVAH is thy name:  
Winds in tempests blowing,  
Waves o'er ocean flowing,  
To remotest regions  
Thy might and power proclaim.

In the heavens' expansion  
Thou hast fixed thy mansion,  
Clouds of endless glory  
Encompassing thy throne!  
Heard but in thy thunders!  
Seen but in thy wonders!  
Through eternal ages  
Thou art God alone!

'Tis thy breath informs us;  
'Tis thy spirit warms us;  
If thy face be turned  
We should cease to be.  
Height nor depth oppose thee,  
Trembling nature knows thee;  
Through the vast creation  
There is none but Thee.

Holy, holy, holy  
Lord God Almighty!  
Thou to whom alone are  
All praise and glory due!  
Holy, holy, holy  
Lord God Almighty!  
Father everlasting!  
Righteous, just, and true!

The sermon was preached by the Rev. R. L. Carpenter, of Birkenhead. The preacher briefly sketched the history of the Assembly. As we have borne the name Presbyterian in all changes of discipline and doctrine, it has ceased to be a descriptive term, and is as it were the *family name* of those who are united by a kindred origin, and nurtured in freedom of thought and a comprehensive brotherly love. The text was from Galatians v. 13, "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another." Most churches commence their existence with a declaration of independence and professions of freedom, but freedom is rarely understood and still more rarely maintained. Denominational bonds are usually destructive of freedom; and indeed freedom by itself cannot hold a church together. Its integrating tendencies must be checked by love and mutual service. Effective work is the origin, justification, maintenance and prerogative of freedom. Our churches pine, because they neglect work in their congregational capacity; for this they sometimes seem to have only one servant—the minister. The old church offices have become nominal, and we have not as yet adequately supplied new ones suited to the times. Freedom will depart from a listless people who forsake service, and from a minister whose service is turned to drudgery, because he is called to a great variety of tasks, for which no man has a gift, and which require for their free performance the co-operation of all. We do not want less freedom of thought or speech, but more freedom of heart and soul, and more "free communion" at other times and places than at the Lord's Supper. Our Domestic Missions thrive because they are free and active—ministries at large. If we wish these and kindred institutions to benefit our churches, we must not let them migrate out from us. We need more of their work within ourselves. Charity must begin at home; and by the performance of our mutual duties, we shall be best enabled to work in the world. Since we take no narrower ground for our denomination than the

whole gospel, we have a work to do wide as Christianity itself, and we need have no fear for our welfare as long as we are faithful to our duty.

The sermon was listened to with deep attention. Its terse, weighty and often epigrammatic sentences, and the characteristic and impressive manner in which it was delivered, together with the high standard of ministerial and congregational duty which it advocated, awakened and sustained for nearly an hour the thoughtful attention of a congregation composed of no common elements. We believe we may promise to our readers the opportunity in these pages of hereafter forming their own judgment on Mr. Carpenter's discourse.

At the close of the religious service, the meeting for transacting the business of the Assembly was held. The chair on these occasions is usually taken by the minister of the chapel, but on this occasion it was felt to be desirable to call to the office of Chairman some one familiar with the routine of the Assembly, and the appointment fell on Rev. John Robberds, of Toxteth Park.

The CHAIRMAN, after alluding to the reasons why he, rather than the actual minister of the chapel, presided, proceeded to say that the aspect of the Assembly forcibly reminded him of the solemn truth, that one generation passeth away and another takes its place. He personally thanked the Assembly for the feeling tribute to the memory of his father, which on the occasion of their last meeting was so eloquently uttered by Mr. Martineau and adopted by his brother ministers. He could assure them that that tribute was neither unfelt nor unappreciated. As Chairman, he knew that he might offer, on the part of the Renshaw-Street congregation and of the Unitarians of Liverpool generally, a hearty welcome to that ancient Assembly. The preacher had in his historical introduction of his discourse, reminded them of the form and spirit of that Assembly in earlier days, and pointed out some of its less praiseworthy qualities. There was no danger now of their relapsing into religious despotism. The tendencies of the Unitarian body were all the other way—to almost excessive individuality of thought and action. There was need of more zealous and united efforts. He believed the Assembly was a very valuable institution, and trusted that upon this and many future occasions it would be the means of strengthening both ministers and people in the great work they had to do.

The roll of the Assembly was then called by Rev. James Whitehead, the Secretary. The ministers attending were Messrs. Ashton, of Preston; Aspland, of Dukinfield; Baker, of Bolton; Beard (D.D.), of Manchester; C. Beard, of Gee Cross; R. L. Carpenter, of Birkenhead; P. P. Carpenter, of Warrington; Channing, of the United States; Colston, of Dean Row; Fogg, of Ormskirk; Frankland, of Chowbent; Gaskell, of Manchester; Green, of Knutsford; Ham, of Manchester; Hardy, of Prescot; Hawkes, of Kendal; W. H. Herford, of Lancaster; B. Herford, of Todmorden; Hoade, of Newchurch; Hutton, of Manchester; Jones, of Gateacre; Lunn, of Dob Lane; Martineau, of Liverpool; Meeke, of Macclesfield; Poynting, of Monton; Ragland, of Hindley; J. Robberds, of Toxteth Park; C. W. Robberds, of Oldham; Smith, of Rochdale; Taylor; Wallace, of Altringham; Whitehead, of Ainsworth; Whitelegg, of Platt; Wells, of Gorton; Wright, of Bury; Wilkinson, of Rochdale.

The Rev. Dr. BEARD, in moving a vote of thanks to the Rev. R. L. Carpenter and the Rev. Mr. Poynting, the preacher and supporter of the day, said it struck him that the subject which had been presented to them by their preacher was admirably illustrated, and that it was a continued exemplification of the combined harmony of liberty and love. He was particularly struck with one remark which the preacher made, because it seemed to him to indicate an actual want, and for himself he must say a long-felt want, in their body. The preacher very properly indeed alluded to what he (Dr. Beard) must think to be amongst them a restriction—a practical restriction of prophetic influence. They did not recognize a priesthood. They might have a system of prophecy—prophetic men, filled with the spirit of God, uttering great truths out of the fulness of their own hearts. Now, if this was a correct idea of the Christian ministry—and it was certainly one which found acceptance in his mind—he did think that they ought not to restrict ministrations to those whom they recognized as ministers, or rather that they ought to extend the term "minister," and find the character of a minister wherever they found the holy life, wherever they found the prophetic power; and if this were done more amongst them, he did firmly believe there would be more religious life, more active benevolence—that they themselves would rejoice in their religious privileges more than they



now did, and that they would exert a far larger influence upon the world. It did appear to be, therefore, desirable that the ideas thrown out by their excellent preacher that morning should receive earnest, and, if it might be so, practical attention. After a brief reference to the preparatory service, the Rev. gentleman concluded by reading the resolution of thanks.

In seconding the resolution, Rev. JAS. MARTINEAU said that both the introductory service and the sermon had been in a high degree acceptable.

The Rev. WILLIAM GASKELL moved a resolution offering on behalf of the Assembly a sincere and cordial welcome to the Rev. Mr. Channing, who from across the Atlantic had so kindly and with such good effect come over to help them. There were many thoughts, the speaker said, which arose in his mind in proposing this resolution, and upon which if he were to touch even in the lightest manner he should occupy more of the time of the meeting than would be expedient. He would only, therefore, single out one or two which had struck him. It could hardly fail to have been a thought, he imagined, which must have arisen in the mind of their American brother when their preacher that morning referred to the period from which that Assembly dated its origin, what was the condition of his own country at that time? The American nation was still quite in its infancy. That noble band whom oppression drove forth from this country to seek for freedom to worship God—those Pilgrim Fathers had only just, it might be said, established themselves on the wild New-England shores; and within the period—short in the history of nations—which had since passed over, see how mighty had been the results which had arisen, and how gloriously had they seen the arm of tyranny turned against itself! He did not think that they could point out any more striking instance to shew how God was overruling the waywardness and folly of His creatures to His own all-wise and righteous ends—any instance from which they could derive greater encouragement—to use the noble words of the poet quoted by their preacher that morning—

“Not to bate a jot

Of heart or hope, but still bear up and  
steer

Right onward.”

Another thought which occurred to him was, that if there be any two nations in the world more than the rest which

ought to be linked in the closest bonds of fraternal union, they were the American nation and our own. Equally descended from those old British patriots whose names were still watchwords throughout the land—our mightiest dead, their mightiest too—having a common share with us and a common reverence with us for the noblest ancestry, including such men as Bacon, Milton and Shakespere, it would indeed be a shame and a sin if these two nations were to suffer any little petty rivalry, any paltry jealousies, ever to come between them and for one moment to divide and estrange them—if they did not take the deepest interest in each other's success, and rejoice in whatever worked for the true greatness and glory of one or the other. There were indeed no reasons for them to think that any lapse of time would divide and estrange the two nations. There was a mighty power which had reduced the vast Atlantic to the proportion of the Indian's “big salt lake;” the voyage between England and America was now reduced to the time formerly occupied by our own countrymen in travelling between the southern and northern metropolis of our own kingdom. Well might they trust that, in consequence of this, the bonds which the past had rivetted on the two nations would be renewed and strengthened daily. He would utter the wish that they might have many visitors from the American shore who would carry back with them increasingly strong affection for the mother country. Peculiar reasons had they for giving a true and hearty welcome to Mr. Channing. He came to them, indeed, with an honoured name—a name that had long been endeared to them, and venerated by them, for exertions in the cause of truth and freedom, and all that worked for human good—a name that stood high in the list of those who had devoted rare and noble powers to the service of God and man, devoted them with unswerving fidelity—the name of one who, by his eloquent pen and his eloquent life, he (Mr. Gaskell) was fully persuaded, had done more than any man that ever lived to soften down the asperities of bigoted feeling in the world, and to some extent the prejudices which orthodoxy had cherished with regard to the peculiar views of the Unitarian body. It must indeed be an arduous and responsible task for a man to prove himself at all worthy to bear such a name; but without any flattery he thought the assembly would agree with him when he said that the friend who came to them bore it well—

(applause)—and it would be superfluous in that place to say how much confidence, esteem and affection Mr. Channing had won for himself in the short time which he had dwelt amongst them, or to assure him that whenever he should return to his native land—might the day be distant!—he could not fail to bear with him the warm wishes and earnest prayers of many here, and that he would leave behind him a memory that would be dear, and they trusted some seeds that would germinate and spring up, and bear blessed fruit.

The Rev. J. WHITEHEAD seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

The Rev. Mr. CHANNING, after briefly acknowledging the compliment, and assuring them that he reciprocated the good wishes of the Assembly, thus continued: It is a most remarkable coincidence, that a lineal descendant of one of the first of the Independent clergy in Massachusetts should be welcomed, at a distance of 200 years, by the descendants of those Presbyterians who were so anxious to cast out the Independents; but it is a fact that I am a lineal descendant of Francis Higginson, of Massachusetts, and this is the old Presbyterian Assembly of 1645. To be sure he had gone in advance, because the dissensions between the Independents and Presbyterians date very much farther back. But allow me, speaking on this occasion of the relations between the Independents and the Presbyterians, to speak a word or two on the progress of religion in the United States. You are aware that religious liberty found its expression there at first through the Independents, or, as we call ourselves in the United States, the Congregationalists. They come from that noble body of whom Robinson was the head. That well-known saying of his, that "more truth is yet to break forth from the Word of God," followed by those other words of his, expressing a deep regret that the followers of Calvin and the followers of Luther had stopped short in their course, when if Luther and Calvin still lived they would be as ready to receive the new light as once they were, has really become a prophecy rapidly fulfilling. It was out of the Congregationalists that came the first great wave of spiritual freedom in the United States; and although it has expressed itself in, I think, a too limited form in the Unitarian denomination, yet on our side of the water both denominations are taking a liberal direction; and I think when we

look back and see the progress Presbyterianism has made in 200 years, we see very clearly that in those 200 years its professors have forgotten their narrow creed, and recognized only the power and the love of God, by which all classes on the earth are comprehended. In regard to the relation between the Independent and Presbyterian denominations, I have one word to say. An effort was made in the United States many years ago in order to unite the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists—the bond of unity was not sufficiently ample for the wants of the time—and so they divided. Still the omen was a good one: and although, as my brother Carpenter said this morning, there is no one Presbyterian church, of which I am aware, which holds Unitarian views, yet the harsh form of Calvinism which the Presbyterians have cherished so long is breaking down, and there is room for the free action of the mind in all charity, and it is an omen for the time to come when Congregationalists and Presbyterians shall be entirely one. While there still remained the old priestly power in the form of the Episcopal church, the Episcopal church was not at first welcomed in the United States; but I can bear my testimony to this fact, that in our republic the Episcopal church is a noble body, a body of enlightenment in the mere point of intellectual culture, a body of more genuine spirit, a body which we cannot spare, simply as a conservative form of Christianity which we need to hold fast by, in order that we may swing clear of both fanaticism and infidelity, and range over the whole course of thought and action. I say I am glad to have the opportunity of stating that the Episcopal church in the United States is a most influential body. There was a time when it was necessary to resist the power of the hierarchy. It was then, with justice, opposed by the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians; but that time has long since passed, and I believe it will come to this, that we shall see that as the Episcopal church widens, it will find itself inevitably in close community in action and spirit, and afterwards in thought, with the Congregationalists and Presbyterians. I have spoken of this because I wish by it to make a few remarks in regard to the several developments of the Christian churches in the United States, and to be enabled to say one word in regard to the religious movements in this country, and you will bear with me in saying how the signs of the times and the religious world in Great

Britain affect a stranger. If I were an Englishman, I would devote my life to this one end—the establishment of a national church; and now, pray do not misunderstand me—I hear a laugh—I do not want any one man to think I am speaking of the church of Henry the Eighth. That is not the national church I have in my mind. No; I stand here to-day as a Presbyterian, if you please, and point back to the time when, sitting in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster, Presbyterianism was recognized as the national religion of Great Britain, and I say this, you do not do yourself justice in taking this position of dissent. Supposing that was the fact once, that you were forced for the moment to stand in the attitude of Dissenters, why not now fall back on the strong grounds of history and say that you always were, and now are, members of the national church of Great Britain, and if the so-called Episcopalian church rise itself in antagonism, why not say to it, “You are schismatic”? It is simply a downright fact, and why should it not be asserted? Now, friends, I do say this in sincerity, and I feel under the influence of the Spirit of Truth, that there is work for all the religious men of Great Britain to do, and that work is the asserting of the living unity of the church of God here, and making that the national church. Demand of that which takes the name of the national church, that it measures itself by the spirit and by the standard of the living God; and then, should its narrowness be proved by its own confession, maintain that it is not the national church of Great Britain. This is the longest day in the year. It is the summer solstice. It is a very long day in Great Britain, when the sun rises very early, and goes down very late; well, then, let me take occasion to express a wish under the symbol of this day—may the sunshine of the God of Love be on one and all of you, early and late, and may the full day of His presence be with you, and be ended by a long twilight of grateful memories and hopes!

Dr. BEARD then offered a fraternal welcome (seconded by Rev. F. BAKER) to the Rev. J. Panton Ham, who since the last meeting of the Assembly had joined the Unitarian body, and had become one of the ministers of Cross-Street chapel in Manchester. He trusted Mr. Ham would find amongst them that liberty and love of which the preacher had that day spoken.

In acknowledging the welcome of the

Assembly, Mr. HAM said that he found in connection with the Unitarian body as much liberty as he had ever enjoyed elsewhere. For five years he had at Bristol stood alone. He never expected to find himself amongst the Unitarians. It took some time indeed to satisfy himself that he was an Unitarian. When he was first charged with the *crime* of Unitarianism, he was greatly startled. At that time he was only in unison with the Unitarian body on the subject of the Atonement. He believed he was now in general doctrinal sympathy with the denomination. He had not indeed fallen in love with the name, but he did love their distinguishing principles and the liberty wherewith Christ made them free. The Independents of this country, he well knew, did not understand the religious position of the Unitarian body. If the Independents better understood Unitarian principles, they would see that the points of contact between the two denominations were far more numerous than the points of contrast. He trusted that a better understanding and a kinder spirit would grow up between the Independents and the Unitarians.

Rev. R. B. ASPLAND then offered a fraternal welcome to Rev. Joseph Meeke, of Macclesfield, and Rev. Mr. Lunn, of Dob Lane, both of whom had entered the province since the last Assembly. Mr. Meeke and Mr. Lunn acknowledged the welcome.

Rev. JAMES MARTINEAU proposed the following resolution: “That lapse of time and uncertainty of usage have rendered the constitution of the Association in some important respects indeterminate, and in particular the right of voting at its meetings is limited by no acknowledged rule or clear definition. That it is desirable so to define the constitution of this Association as to render it the organ of expression in affairs of common interest, not to the ministers only who are convened to its meeting by circular, but to their congregations also. That a committee be appointed to prepare a plan by which this object may be realized, and all inconvenient doubt respecting the limits of membership may be removed, and to report their proposals to the meeting next year.” In introducing this resolution, Mr. Martineau said he had long felt that there was something unsatisfactory in the extremely ill-defined constitution under which the Assembly existed and met from year to year. He was by no means in favour of a pedantic legislation where an existing system works well. But he thought they could scarcely



say this of the particular constitution under which they met. At their meeting at Warrington, a question was raised in relation to the persons entitled to vote. He did not wish to re-open or particularly refer to the question then discussed. A doubt was felt whether the ministers alone should vote, or whether the members of the congregation should be invited also to vote. Their Secretary himself seemed doubtful about the matter, and gave an opinion at first which he presently revoked, that the ministers alone should vote. He (Mr. Martineau) did not intend to argue in favour of one opinion or the other, but he wished to put an end to the uncertainty that evidently existed. Though he had no opinion to give in favour of one or other of these two decisions, resting upon purely constitutional grounds, he had no doubt which of these two decisions would be the better work for the future. He had no desire whatever to exclude the lay element from their Assembly. Their Assembly was originally connected with a presbytery, and in every presbytery, it is known, the lay element exists. Elders are elected by the several congregations. He believed that it was a very desirable thing that mere ecclesiastical conclaves should not exist, but that they have a proper system of lay representation. It was matter of usage to bring before the Assembly questions interesting to all. They had petitions upon Education, University Reform, Church-rates, &c. Upon such occasions it would be an intolerable mockery to invite laymen to attend and then to tell them they had no vote. But if admitted, it should be according to some principle or rule. It is not proper that a mere accidental assemblage of persons should take upon themselves to represent the churches of the two counties. It seemed to be a plain matter of common sense that they should have a limit placed and a qualification established. The laymen who took part in their proceedings should be an elected body. The Assembly consisted of a group of congregations. The ministers attended, not as individuals, but as the representatives of congregations. He proposed that each congregation should be asked to send lay as well as ministerial representatives. Mr. Martineau then detailed how the election and credentials of the lay representatives should be effected. On these details it was not his wish to ask for a vote at present. He simply wished the Assembly now to recognize the fact of the undefined and uncertain character of their Assembly.

He was not advocating the establishment of anything like a presbytery, or the creation of any power over individual congregations. He did not desire the Assembly to be anything more than what it now was, an organ for the spontaneous expression of the opinions of the churches comprehended in the province.

After considerable discussion, in which Messrs. Aspland, Herford, Baker, Chas. Beard, Whitehead and Wrigley, took part, Mr. Martineau's resolution was passed; and the following gentlemen were appointed a committee to carry it into effect—Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. James Whitehead, Rev. James Martineau, Mr. Lampport, Mr. Heywood and Mr. Holbrook Gaskell.

Rev. R. B. ASPLAND then, by desire of the Committee, introduced the subject of Church-rates, and described the Bill of Sir William Clay and that of the Archbishop of Canterbury. He had prepared the draft of a Petition to both Houses of Parliament, in which especial reference was made to the objectionable features of the Archbishop's Bill. Without any wish as Dissenters to interfere with the religious arrangements of Churchmen in matters of worship, they still felt bound to protect where they could the civil rights and religious freedom of Churchmen as jealously as they would their own. The Bill now before the House of Lords seemed to threaten the abridgment of the rights of members of the Church of England. The Petition also recognized the interest which all Englishmen are entitled to feel in the beautiful ecclesiastical structures which adorn the land. He, for one, regarded them as national property, and would never consent to give them up to be the exclusive and inalienable property of any one sect. The Petition was then read by Mr. Aspland, and adopted by the Assembly.

To the Right Honourable the Lords Temporal and Spiritual in Parliament assembled:

The Petition of the English Presbyterians and Unitarians of Lancashire and Cheshire, agreed upon at their annual Provincial Assembly, held in Liverpool, June 21st, 1855,

Humbly sheweth,

That your petitioners are ministers and members of Nonconformist congregations, who build their own churches, support their own worship, and pay their own clergy.

That in the opinion of your petitioners it is unjust to compel any man to pay for

religious worship in which he takes no part, and from which he conscientiously dissents.

That, in the present divided state of religious opinion in England and Wales, it is inexpedient as well as unjust to tax all for maintaining the worship of any one religious denomination.

That the vestry meetings held for authorizing Church-rates often lead to angry debates and dissensions injurious to the peace of society and the influence of religion, as well as derogatory to the character of the clergy.

That the enforced collection of rates levied by the vote of a majority, often leads to costly and mischievous litigation, and perpetuates feelings of anger and mutual alienation between fellow-citizens.

That while regarding with pride the cathedrals and parish churches built by their forefathers as the inalienable property of the whole nation, your petitioners believe that by an improved management of ecclesiastical property ample funds may be procured to keep them in due repair.

That it is proper that the expenses of the worship of each congregation should be raised by voluntary subscription, or by a rate levied only on the actual worshippers.

That your petitioners hear with satisfaction that the subject of the abolition of Church-rates is under the consideration of your Right Honourable House, and humbly pray that in any measure which may be passed, effectual provision may be made for the entire cessation of Church-rates, not only in parishes where rates have been refused by the vestry, but in all places throughout the kingdom; and that in providing means for the support of public worship in churches now dependent on Church-rates, your Right Honourable House will give equal rights to all to whom the duty belongs and on whom the burthen falls.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. WHITEHEAD, in seconding the adoption of the Petition, said that he entirely concurred in the opinions expressed by Mr. Aspland, and greatly admired the way in which they were embodied in the Petition.

The Petition having been adopted by the Assembly, it was resolved that that to the Commons should be entrusted for presentation to Thomas Thornely, Esq., M.P.

Rev. F. BAKER stated that the fund for defraying the annual expenses of the Assembly was completed, and £200 now in the bank awaited investment.

Additional Trustees were appointed, viz. Revds. C. Wallace, J. Wright and J. Cropper, and Messrs. M'Connel, Booth and Thomas Baker.

Rev. R. L. CARPENTER said most of those present had read in the *Christian Reformer* and *Inquirer* references to proceedings at law which had recently taken place in America in respect to the church in Federal Street, Boston (U.S.). That church had been founded in 1727 by certain families of Scotch descent. It is not usual to vest American chapels and churches in Trustees; they generally belong to proprietors. Each generation of proprietors can make any change they think desirable. The Presbyterian form of church government was changed for the Congregational. In 1809, a new structure was erected by the congregation. The church of Federal Street was one of the largest in Boston. Dr. Channing had been and Dr. Gannett was the minister of it. The Congregational form of church government had been substituted without regard to doctrine. It followed the destiny of other societies and became Unitarian. Within the last few years, certain Scottish Presbyterians, not in the least related to the original founders of the building, instituted a suit at law to obtain for themselves possession of the building. The claim, monstrously unjust, was resisted, and eventually judgment was given, which on every point was in favour of the Unitarian possessors. Englishmen felt an interest in the Federal-Street church as the place where for so many years Dr. Channing preached the word of life. Dr. Gannett, the present minister, was one who felt a very deep interest in his Unitarian brethren of England. It was in his church that the annual meeting of the Unitarian Association in May was held. It was quite right that the Assembly should offer to Dr. Gannett and his congregation an expression of sympathy, and congratulate them on the successful vindication of religious liberty in the defeat of the attempt to wrest from them their church. He concluded with moving the following resolution: "That this Assembly, having for many generations exercised the liberty inherited from their forefathers, to change their form of government and of doctrine in accordance with conscience, and being confirmed in their prescriptive rights by the law of the land, is rejoiced to learn that the laws of New England have protected the congregation in

Federal Street, Boston, U.S., in the possession of property bequeathed them by their fathers, who voluntarily exchanged Presbyterianism for Congregationalism, and invited the holy teaching of the gospel, untrammelled by human creed. And accordingly they request their Secretary to tender their Christian sympathy and fraternal congratulations to the congregation, and to Dr. Gannett, the respected pastor of the Federal-Street society."

The motion having been seconded by Rev. W. GASKELL, Rev. P. P. CARPENTER, of Warrington, said he should not offer any amendment, because the resolution did not imply any approbation of Dr. Gannett's course of action on the Slavery question. But the expression of sympathy with Dr. Gannett on another subject forced from him (Mr. P. P. C.) the expression of regret that Dr. G. had not seen fit to imitate his great predecessor Channing on the momentous subject of American Slavery. (*Murmurs of dissent.*)

Mr. RATHBONE expressed his regret at the introduction of this subject. They were really not in a position to judge fairly of the conduct of Dr. Gannett in relation to it.

Rev. W. H. CHANNING said his brother Carpenter must bear with a remark from him. If Dr. Channing were alive, he might dissent in judgment from some particular opinions of Dr. Gannett, but he would, he (Mr. C.) felt assured, offer to him the tribute of his most hearty respect and confidence in the purity of his motives on this and every subject. He would add that Dr. Gannett was eminently a man of judgment in all practical matters. He had known him long and intimately. When he was a boy, he had sat under him; as a man, he had acted with him; and he could bear his unhesitating testimony to his steadfast and consistent course. He had seen, too, on this particular question of Slavery, a steady onward progress in Dr. Gannett's mind. As an Abolitionist of the Abolitionists, his friend Carpenter would accept this testimony from him.

The resolution having been put, was unanimously adopted.

Rev. JAMES WHITEHEAD then stated that the Committee had been particularly impressed with the importance of these meetings in certain localities. They excited a great deal of interest, and it was thought desirable to extend them as widely as possible. The Committee had adopted a resolution to the

effect, "That it is expedient to revise and enlarge the curriculum of the Provincial Assembly from time to time, and that, in addition to the twelve places where the meetings have been held heretofore, the following places, the congregations and ministers of which have expressed a desire to receive the Assembly, be added to the list—Stand and Rochdale, in Lancashire; Dean Row, in Cheshire; and that the next annual meeting be held at Stand, in June, 1856."

The recommendation of the Committee to hold the next annual meeting at Stand was adopted unanimously.

A ballot was then taken, and the supporter for the next year was declared to be Rev. W. H. Channing.

Rev. T. E. POYNTING, who is in regular course the preacher next year, then rose and expressed his strong wish that Mr. Channing should be the preacher as well as supporter next year, it being uncertain whether he would remain in England a sufficient length of time to enable him to fill the office of preacher in 1857.

This suggestion appearing to meet the earnest concurrence of the Assembly, a resolution to this effect was put and carried unanimously.

In acknowledging the vote, Mr. CHANNING expressed his readiness to give a conditional acceptance of the office. If he were enabled to remain in England till that day twelvemonth, he would cheerfully be their preacher.\* As he had stated to the Renshaw-Street congregation, circumstances might occur which would recall him before that time to his native land.

The Provincial Committee was then appointed, and cordial thanks were moved to the Renshaw-Street congregation for their markedly kind reception of the Assembly, and to the Rev. John Robberds for his conduct in the chair.—The whole proceedings in the chapel lasted upwards of four hours. At the close of them, some adjourned

\* In consequence of this vote, at a meeting of many of the ministers subsequently held, it was thought inexpedient to hold the next meeting at Stand, the chapel of which place it was thought would not hold the congregation that might be expected to assemble. Opinions were expressed by some in favour of Dukinfield, by others in favour of Manchester, as the best place for the Assembly. The matter lies now in the hands of the Committee.



to visit the beautiful and richly-adorned church in Hope Street, while others went to St. George's Hall, probably the largest and most beautiful Hall in the world, where they listened to the powerful tones of the new organ, for which a player had been kindly provided to enable them to judge of its excellence.

At five o'clock, a numerous party sat down to dinner at the Adelphi Hotel, under the presidency of Mr. Rathbone. Amongst the guests were nearly all the ministers of the two counties; Mr. S. Bright, Mr. H. A. Bright, Mr. J. B. Yates, Mr. Richard Yates, Mr. Thomas Boulton, Mr. G. Holt, Mr. S. Thornely, Mr. J. Thornely, all of Liverpool; Mr. David Harrison, of Stalybridge; Mr. Samuel Ashton, of Hyde; Mr. Andrews, of Rivington. With the interesting speeches delivered at this meeting, our exhausted space entirely prevents our dealing. The sentiments proposed are, however, well entitled to a place in our pages.

1. The Chairman proposed—Her Majesty the Queen: long may she reign over a people faithful to her, united among themselves, and true to the laws of right and the liberties of the world.

2. The Chairman—Prince Albert and all the members of the Royal Family, and may they inherit from him the taste for noble arts, and the impulse to a comprehensive benevolence.

3. The Chairman—Our Country, its free institutions and beneficent progress: may she be moderate and just in the exercise of her power, while ever in sympathy with the noblest aspirations of other lands—Responded to by Rev. James Martineau.

4. The Chairman—Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over; and may England and America, the first to start the problem, work together for its final solution—Rev. William Henry Channing.

5. The Chairman—The Lancashire and Cheshire Provincial Association; and may every anniversary added to its two hundred and tenth, increase its inheritance of wisdom from the past, and send it fuller of the Christian spirit into the future—Rev. Robert Brook Aspland.

6. The Chairman—The Preacher and Supporter of the day—Rev. Russell Lant Carpenter and Rev. T. E. Poynting.

7. Thomas Bolton, Esq.—Our Institutions for Theological Education: may they raise up a succession of ministers well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, and able, by the full mind and the

large heart, to serve alike the intellectual and the popular wants of their age—Rev. Dr. Beard.

8. Charles Lampert, Esq.—Honour to the founders of the Ministers' Stipend Augmentation Fund, and may their munificence cheer the heart and foster the independence of many a generation of faithful ministers. May the comprehensive spirit which has presided over its foundation always prevail in its distribution—George Holt, Esq.

9. The Chairman—The Widows' Fund—Joseph Brooks Yates, Esq.

The addresses of Mr. Martineau and Mr. Channing will not be soon forgotten by those who had the pleasure of hearing them. The philosophical wisdom and simple eloquence of the former, and the mingled wit and eloquence of the latter, afforded a high intellectual treat. In the speeches of Mr. Lampert and Mr. Holt, the first public announcement was made of the Fund raised to supply to the Unitarian ministers of the Northern counties the aid formerly rendered by the Hewley Trustees. Towards that Fund the sum of £17,000 has been already raised by the agency, as untiring as his own contribution is munificent, of Mr. Christopher Rawdon. In our next No. we propose to give some account of this important foundation.—After the dinner party broke up, the guests proceeded by invitation to the mansion of Mr. George Holt, where a large *réunion* of friends took place, and opportunities were given of much pleasant and friendly intercourse.

On the following morning, the ministers who were members of the *Widows' Fund* met at the Adelphi Hotel for the transaction of the business of that important Society. The Secretary, Rev. James Whitehead, and the Treasurer, Mr. Robert Heywood, were able to congratulate the members on the prosperous condition of their affairs. The income of the Widows' Fund during the past year has been £852. 17s., while the expenditure has been less than £250. The year's income of the Auxiliary Benevolent Fund (including, however, a balance from the previous year of £251) is £435. The grants made last year amounted only to £35; this year they were considerably increased. The capital stock of both funds now amounts to £10,347. 12s. 10d.

In the afternoon, the ministers went by invitation to the residence of Mr. J. B. Yates, where they met many friends, and in the enjoyment of the

hospitality of their kind host, in the inspection of literary curiosities and works of art, and in walks in the beautiful grounds of the Dingle, the afternoon was passed in a most agreeable manner. It was mentioned at the dinner the previous day by the Secretary, that to the exertions of the late Rev. John Yates the Auxiliary Fund owed its existence, a very large portion of its original capital having been subscribed in Liverpool. It was very agreeable on this occasion, to the members of the Widows' Fund, to meet many members of the family of their former friend and benefactor. By the older members, pleasant reminiscences of former times were called forth, and the names of Yates, Shepherd, Grundy, Davies and Robberds, were affectionately and reverently alluded to.

In the evening, the proceedings of this very interesting meeting were brought to a close by a Soirée, held in the upper school-room connected with the Hope-street church. The Gothic style of the architecture of the room gave scope for the exercise of skill and taste in its adornment. From all parts of the lofty unceiled roof, gay flags depended. Wherever the eye lighted, a profusion of flowers—some of them choice specimens of conservatory floral beauty—were to be seen. On the dais of the Chairman and his friends there were some beautiful green plants very ornamentally placed. The tables were covered with prints, autographs and works of art. The room was filled by a brilliant assembly of 500 persons, nearly one-half of whom were ladies. Tea, coffee and other refreshments were served to the guests at the side-tables. A numerous band of vocal performers, led and accompanied on the piano by Mr. Ames, gave, as the evening advanced, some beautiful music of Mendelssohn and others. The meeting had the benefit of Mr. Martineau's presidency, and the speeches uttered were not unworthy of the occasion. The addresses of several of the young laymen of Liverpool were listened to with deep and gratified attention. They indicated the union of high intellectual culture with zealous attachment to Unitarian Christianity. The speech of Mr. Channing was as remarkable as it was powerful. He dwelt tenderly and reverently on the memory of his late venerated uncle, and in warm and eloquent terms reproached the orthodox "slander" that towards the close of his life Dr. Channing faltered in his Uni-

tarianism. He asked every individual of that large assembly to receive his solemn assurance that Dr. Channing was to the last hour of his life an earnest Unitarian, and if they ever heard the contrary asserted, to give it an immediate unhesitating refutation.

The sentiments proposed and seconded, like those given the day before, were admirably worded, and we cannot better use the space we have left than in recording them and the names of the speakers.

The pious Memory of the Two Thousand Ministers, whose ejection from the Church laid the foundations of Nonconformity in the experiences of suffering and acts of faith; and hearty welcome to all who, in like obedience to God, are constrained to seek a church for their conscience other than the church of their birth—W. J. Lamport, Esq.; Rev. Panton Ham.

The Churches of America kindred with our own: honour to their many wise teachers and faithful men, and a fraternal greeting to the living successor of the name and spirit of Channing—Rev. W. H. Channing.

Success to the efforts of all comprehensive and earnest Christianity on the continent of Europe; through good report and evil report, may its ministers and disciples prepare in faith their contribution to the final unity of Christendom—Rev. W. Gaskell; H. A. Bright, Esq.

The work of Domestic Missions; and by multiplying the special agencies of Christian love, may they shew how the hardest problems of civilized society find solution in the simplicity of the gospel—W. Rathbone, Esq., Jun.; Rev. J. H. Hutton.

Our grateful acknowledgment of the services rendered by the *Inquirer* newspaper and the *Christian Reformer*; and may we learn from them, with equal willingness, to hold fast what is good, and supply what is defective, in our modes of religious thought and life—W. Rathbone, Esq.; Rev. R. B. Aspland.

The work of elementary religious instruction: may every congregation have its school, and every school its sufficient staff of teachers, and every teacher the Christian mind—Rev. J. Wright.

Although our report has extended beyond the limits we usually assign to intelligence of this description, we leave with regret much unreported. The series of meetings and entertainments was, without exception, successful and brilliant. There was seen the

combination of free speech and the utterance of individual convictions with cordial unanimity of spirit. The ministers quitted Liverpool at the close of the week with a feeling of warm gratitude for the kindness shewn them; and the ministers and members of the Liverpool congregations must have felt themselves not unrewarded for their hospitable exertions by the high moral tone, the religious spirit and the united feeling which characterized what was (though not quite accurately) denominated the "210th meeting of the Provincial Assembly."

ANNUAL EXAMINATION OF MANCHESTER  
NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

The second annual examination of the students of this College since its removal to London took place in the week beginning Monday, June 26. The examination began on that day with the junior class in Ecclesiastical History, consisting of Messrs. Scott, Drummond and Rogers. The questions related to Hebrew Monotheism and the Christian History of the first and second centuries. The Principal stated that he had every reason to be satisfied with the attention paid by the class. There had been three term examinations, and the questions ranged over the entire course of the session. He had advised the students not to confine themselves in their answers to the matter given in the lectures, but to incorporate with them whatever they had found in their private reading. This circumstance and the fulness of the answers made it scarcely possible for each student to answer all the questions. The hour allotted to this examination did not permit even a fourth of the excellent answers actually written to be read.

The Rev. G. V. Smith then examined his class in the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion. The question-paper contained twenty-three subjects, each of them branching into several questions. The answers were very full, and could only be partially read. The Principal then took the examination of the second class in Ecclesiastical History (Messrs. Smith, Whitehead and Coe). The question-paper ranged over the third, fourth and fifth centuries, and included many subjects of interest, such as the early opinions on the person of Christ, Manichæism, the early history of the doctrine of the Trinity, the asceticism of the early

Christians, the Arian controversy, Monachism, the rise of the Mass, and early opinions respecting the Eucharist. It was regretted by those present that so few friends attended to hear the very satisfactory examination of this class. A sermon was then read by Mr. Drummond, from Ps. xiv. 1, on the Being of a God; and by Mr. Rogers, from James v. 16, on Prayer. After an interval of half an hour, during which the visitors and others partook of luncheon, the examination was resumed by Rev. G. V. Smith with the junior class in Hebrew, consisting of Messrs. Bakewell, Rogers, Heavyside and Dare. The Professor stated that the class had also been attended by Mr. Scott. The class had begun the study of Hebrew that session, and had been much occupied with the elements of the grammar. It had also read a considerable part of the book of Genesis. The examination would be confined to that portion of work on which the class had been engaged since Easter. Passages from Genesis xxi. and xxii. were translated, and searching grammatical questions were answered. The Principal then took the class which is an appendage to the Ecclesiastical History (consisting of Messrs. Jones, Drummond, Smith, Crozier and Whitehead). The custom was to read each session portions of a Christian and a Heathen writer, generally contemporaries. The class would be examined in passages of the 2nd and 4th books of the work of Origen in reply to Celsus. The class had no previous intimation of the passages in which the examination would be taken, but they were selected by the Professor from the whole work of the session. The translations were illustrated by the students, as they proceeded, by answers to biographical and historical questions. The proceedings of the day were brought to a close by a sermon by Mr. Crozier on Self-denial, from Matt. xvi. 24. Mr. Carter was prevented by illness from taking any part in the work of the examination. Amongst the visitors who attended during portions of the proceedings were Mr. Mark Philips, Mr. H. C. Robinson, Mr. James Yates, Rev. John Kenrick (Visitor), Rev. George Kenrick, Rev. T. L. Marshall, Rev. R. B. Aspland (Secretary), Rev. D. Davison, and Rev. D. Jeremy.

On Tuesday morning, the examination was resumed by the Principal with the class of Doctrinal and Practical Theology (junior and senior), consist-



ing of Messrs. Jones, Coe, Scott, Drummond, Crozier and Rogers. The question-paper of the junior class related to Christian Principles, and that of the senior class to Christian Doctrines and Institutions. The answers were very full, and the examination was remarkably interesting,—the more so as some of the topics, such as intuitions, baptism, and forms of church government, are matters on which very different views are taken by the Unitarian body. The next class, consisting of Messrs. Coe, Blazeby, Upton and Holland, was the middle Hebrew, examined by Rev. G. V. Smith. During the session the class had read a considerable part of the book of Genesis and of the Psalms. The examination, which was confined to that portion of the Psalms which had been read since Easter, was very satisfactory.

The Principal then examined the middle class in Doctrinal and Practical Theology, consisting of Messrs. Whitehead, Coe and E. Smith. The paper contained nineteen principal questions (some of them branching into several questions) on Christian Doctrines, including those of the Catholics, Lutherans, English Episcopalians, Independents, Scottish Presbyterians, Socinians and Quakers. The answers read by the class were full and accurate, and were heard with much interest by those present. The class in Moral Philosophy was next examined by Rev. James Martineau. The class had been engaged in reading Butler (the three sermons) and Paley's Moral Philosophy, forming the course prescribed to the undergraduates by the University of London in the B. A. examination. The Professor had explained the authors, and examined the students as they proceeded through them. The class acquitted themselves well in a very difficult examination.

In the afternoon, the proceedings began with the senior class in Hebrew, consisting of Messrs. Jones, E. Smith, Drummond, Whitehead and Crozier. Rev. G. V. Smith stated that the class had read during the session a considerable portion of Isaiah. The examination was taken in only a portion of the sessional work. Besides the translation of passages selected at the time, it included questions of grammar, history and criticism. In this and the other Hebrew classes there were gratifying signs of improvement. The Professor announced that there had been a voluntary written examination

of the senior class, for which Messrs. E. Smith and Drummond had gone in, and that the Prize which had been offered by Joseph B. Yates, Esq., of Liverpool, had been so ably contested, that it had been determined to divide it between the two competitors, as of equal merit. The Logic class (consisting of Messrs. E. Smith and Rogers) followed. Mr. Martineau explained that it was, like that in Moral Philosophy, essentially an undergraduate class, intended to prepare the students for the examination of the University. The only book prescribed to be read for the degree is Whately's Logic. In order to make the reading of Whately more intelligent, and to widen the range of the reading of the students, he had thought it desirable to introduce them to some knowledge of the writings of Aristotle. The course had therefore consisted of two distinct parts,—first of all, a complete system of logic, gathered from the writings of Aristotle, the reading of which had the effect of familiarizing them with Aristotle's terminology; the second part referred to Whately. In the examination, both portions of the course were mingled. The paper contained twenty-one principal questions, most of which had been satisfactorily answered by the class.

The proceedings of the day were brought to a conclusion by sermons from Mr. Scott (John x. 16), on the Universal Fold of Christ; and from Mr. Coe (Coloss. iv. 17, 18), on the Christian Ministry. In addition to the visitors of the previous day, there were present Rev. Hugh Hutton, Rev. Dr. Sadler, Rev. Henry Solly, Rev. J. Malleson, Rev. J. R. M'Kie, Mr. Sam. Carter and Mr. Warren.

The examination was resumed and (except that of the undergraduates in Classics and Mathematics) was brought to a close on Wednesday, June 27. The attendance of Trustees and visitors was more numerous than on any preceding day, and included, in addition to those already mentioned, Mr. Ed-dowes Bowman, Mr. J. A. Yates, Mr. R. N. Philips, Mr. Thomas Ainsworth, Mr. E. W. Field, Rev. Edward Tagart, Rev. R. Shaen, Mr. W. Wansey, Mr. R. D. Darbishire, Mr. H. Busk, &c. The business of the day commenced with the class in the Greek New Testament. The Theological Professor (Rev. G. V. Smith) stated that the class included all the divinity students, in two divisions. They had during

the session read the book of Acts minutely. They were examined in the latter part of the book, particularly chap. xxvi. (the account of Paul's shipwreck), and translated and answered the questions with much accuracy. The Principal then examined the senior class of Ecclesiastical History in Seneca. The books read during the session were those *De Providentiâ* and *De vitâ beatâ*. The Professor of Theology next examined the senior class in the Criticism and Interpretation of the New Testament. The question-paper was drawn up under twenty-nine heads. The answers were long and very carefully given. Time only allowed a very short selection to be made from them. The senior class in Ecclesiastical History followed, examined by the Principal. It included the history of the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries. The work of the morning was brought to a close by a sermon by Mr. Whitehead, from John x. 1, on the False Methods of entering the Christian Fold. After luncheon had been served, Mr. Martineau brought the examination of the classes to a conclusion with that in Mental Philosophy. The question-paper contained twenty-five principal questions, ranging through many of the most profound and subtle metaphysical topics. The answers, previously prepared in writing (as in the case of all the other classes), without the help of books or notes, were minute and generally satisfactory. Mr. E. Smith read a sermon on Salvation, from Acts xvi. 30, and Mr. Jones on Religious Sincerity, from Rom. xiv. 5. After a short pause, a considerable number of ladies entered the Hall to hear the Visitor's address. The number of visitors was also increased by the appearance of the gentlemen acting as Trustees of the Hibbert Fund. Mr. Kenrick's address (which we will not injure by an abridgment, but reserve for our next No., in which it shall receive a better welcome than in our double columns and smaller type) referred in some detail to the recent admission of Dissenters to the University of Oxford, and then contained some counsels, full of wisdom and kindness, to the young men entering on the exercise of the ministry.

In the course of the address, Mr. Kenrick announced the award of two Prizes, of Five Guineas each, offered by Joseph Brooks Yates, Esq., of Liverpool, for session of 1854-55.

1. Prize for greatest proficiency in Hebrew, for Manchester New College students in their *theological* years—divided between R. Drummond in his first, and Mr. Edwin Smith in his second, theological year.

2. Prize for greatest proficiency in Latin studies and Latin composition, for undergraduates of Manchester New College and University Hall. Ten competitors went in for this Prize, seven lay students from University Hall, and three Manchester New College students, Mr. Blazeby, Mr. Upton and Mr. Dare. The examinations were conducted in writing on three successive evenings, by Mr. A. Scott, on the part of the Manchester New College students, and by Mr. Gibbs, the Classical Tutor of University Hall, on behalf of the lay students of that institution. After examination of the papers, Mr. Upton, of Manchester New College, and Mr. Talfourd Ely,\* of University Hall, were unanimously declared to be equal, and the Prize was in consequence divided between them.

At the close of the proceedings, the Principal announced that the students were expected to re-assemble on the first Friday in October.

#### AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this Association, for business, was held in the Freeman-Place chapel, May 29th, at nine o'clock a.m. Prayer was offered by Rev. Cazneau Palfrey, of Belfast, Me. The record of the last annual meeting was read, the report of the Treasurer, and an abstract of the Executive Committee's report.

From these reports it appears that the receipts of the last year have been 21,771 dollars, and the expenditures 21,214 dols. This includes the receipts for the Book Fund during the year, and the amount expended in the publication of books. There has thus far been received for the Book Fund, in all, about 20,000 dols., which includes some of the receipts of the previous year. The amount expended this year in the publication of books is 10,925 dols. Books have been sold during the year to the number of 16,000, the receipts for which have been 2,888 dols. The amount of aid rendered to new and feeble societies has been 2,207 dols., and a considerable sum has been expended for necessary purposes.

\* Grandson of the late J. T. Rutt, and nephew of the late Mr. Justice Talfourd.



Among the sentiments given and responded to were,

"The Christian Woman—from the earliest days she has saved the people; may we never be without her until we cease to love her." This called up Rev. Mr. HOLLAND, of East Cambridge, who responded in appropriate terms, in which he commended the labours and Christian graces of ministers' wives, whose husbands he thought often retained their places, partly by their grace, as well as by the grace of God. He gave an anecdote of the hospitality of a minister's wife, of whom he had heard, who received a guest while she was engaged in some laborious part of her household duties, and when a friend of hers was asked if the minister's wife performed such labours, the answer given was, "My friend, if you ever get to heaven, those whom you will find in the front rank of Christian martyrs there are ministers' wives."

"Our Brother in England, Rev. W. H. Channing. We remember him today. Our heart is with him in his labours. He carries our faith to the homes of our fathers. We feel assured his works will praise him."—Rev. JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE was called upon to respond to this sentiment.

At the evening meeting, the Secretary, Rev. Dr. MILES, read a portion of the Executive Committee's report, setting forth a plan already adopted, for the publication of a series of Libraries to be called "The Biblical Library," "The Theological Library," "The Devotional Library," &c. Of the last the first number has been issued—the new Prayer-book, called the "Altar at Home"—of which four editions have been issued in the course of a few weeks. The report gave a minute account of the establishment of three missionary stations during the past year, and the appointment of four missionaries, who are now engaged in the mission upon which they have been sent. These missionary fields are the new territory of Kansas, the region beyond the Mississippi, occupied by the Chippewa Indians, and the far-off region of India; and the missionaries who have gone to these several fields of labour are the Rev. Ephraim Nute, formerly of Chicopee, in this State; Rev. Mr. Tanner, a native of the Chippewa tribe; and Rev. Mr. Dall, late of Toronto, Canada West. It also dwelt upon many encouraging signs of promise that should animate us to renewed diligence and labour. The history of

the Association was referred to, the fact of this being its thirtieth anniversary, and the enlarged plans which it had originated for future usefulness, closing with an eloquent appeal for aid and support from the denomination, and a touching tribute to the life and character of one of its former officers and members, who has departed from us the past year—Rev. Frederick T. Gray.

Rev. Dr. GANNETT, being called upon, moved the adoption and printing of the report, because he thought it was an excellent one, and because it referred to the origin of this Association—to days the memory of which came up with a pleasant fragrance to some here—memories of a little back apartment, with small book-shelves; of this house where many a flashing eye had been, now gazing upon this scene from the spirit-land. Here were Henry Ware, whose name it needed but to mention; another who presided in honour over a great institution; and others present to-night, whose grey hairs covered as young hearts as darker hairs covered thirty years ago. With those who then gathered here, Unitarianism meant that liberal form of Christianity which was meant to overcome on the one hand orthodoxy, on the other infidelity. With this interpretation, there were two effects wished to be produced; one to establish the truth of the principles which we taught, and the second to secure their legitimate effects in active life. And it was our duty now, as ministers, as people, to hold fast to these two aims in the present and the future. It became us, as true disciples, to stand up in defence of these simple truths, which made this a separate denomination.—It was bad policy for us to stand on neutral ground: if we would win respect, if we would wake up the earnest feelings of our people and secure their sympathies, we must have an ardent attachment to truth, and to the tenets and methods which made us a peculiar people. In his concluding remarks, Dr. Gannett expressed the belief that Unitarians were the true evangelical Christians, for they looked at the New Testament in its true light; and from his studies he wondered how any person could find anything of Calvinism or Trinitarianism between the covers of the Bible. No opinions could make better men on earth, or riper Christians for heaven, than those of Unitarian Christianity.



## OBITUARY.

May 24, at Tenterden, THOMAS B. SHOORBRIDGE, Esq., aged 65. He was Mayor of the borough for the fourth time at the period of his death. He was also Justice of the Peace. Mr. Shoorbridge was a man of great energy of character, and by his decease the town and neighbourhood have sustained a great loss. He was throughout life a warm friend of civil and religious liberty, an earnest supporter of unsectarian education, and by his removal the Tenterden British Schools have been deprived of a generous contributor, and one whose advice and assistance was invaluable as a member of the Committee. Whatever also was calculated to promote the temporal welfare of those whose support depended on their daily labour, met with his warm sympathy and efficient help. Mr. Shoorbridge was one of the original founders of the Tenterden Provident Society, an institution designed to afford aid in time of sickness, and also to provide a burial fund. Of this Society he was Chairman from its formation to the period of his death. Between twenty and thirty years this institution has fulfilled its benevolent objects; the number of individuals now partaking of its benefits are between four and five hundred. These happy results were in no small degree owing to the business talent and financial foresight of the President. Whatever business he took up, he made it for the time his own. Not only the public, but many also in private life, will feel the want of his advice and aid. To his family his loss is wholly irreparable. He was a constant attendant on Unitarian worship, and in his last illness expressed his full satisfaction with the comforting and supporting power of the faith in which he had lived. He was ever present at all meetings called to promote the interests of the religious society with which he was connected, and all efforts to advance what he deemed the unadulterated truths of the gospel had his hearty sympathy. Rarely was he absent, either in London or in the country, from the annual meetings of his Unitarian brethren.

He was interred on the 31st of May in the burial-ground adjoining the Unitarian chapel, Tenterden, by his friend and pastor, the Rev. Edward Talbot. During the funeral, the shops in the town were closed and all business suspended, and a very large number of the friends and neighbours of the deceased

were present. Many members of the Tenterden Provident Society joined the funeral procession. On the following Sunday there was a large attendance at the chapel, and a sermon was delivered, from Col. iii. 1—4, on the right use of things seen, as a preparation for things unseen. In his discourse the minister paid a deserved tribute of affectionate respect to the memory of the deceased, and exhorted the young who were present to carry on the good work of those who had gone before them. "Helpers," said the preacher, "may be withdrawn; but God will raise up needful agents for the fulfilment of his will. Sons, carry on your fathers' work. Young men, as your fathers are withdrawn, fill their places. Let not the torch they drop become quenched; keep alive the flame, and transmit its blessed light to those that shall come after you."

June 7, at his country seat, Arnside, Westmoreland, THOMAS RODICK, Esq., J. P., and Deputy-Lieutenant for the county of Lancaster, in his 67th year. Mr. Rodick's permanent residence was at Gateacre, near Liverpool, where for many years he was a member of the congregation of the late venerable Dr. Shepherd, and enjoyed his intimate friendship. If there was one feature of his character more conspicuous than another, it was his domestic affections and sympathies. He was a most kind and hospitable friend, not only to those with whom he was most intimate, but to all who required and deserved his assistance. In his public capacity as a magistrate, he was distinguished by assiduity in attending to his duties, and by tempering justice with mercy. As a guardian of the expenditure of the county, he was vigilant in the detection of extravagance and partiality, and became a powerful check to abuse. His loss is deeply deplored by a large and affectionate family, and by an extensive circle of friends.

It is with profound regret that we record the death, on Sunday, June 10, at Park Street, Bristol, of JOHN BISHOP ESTLIN, Esq., aged 69. In a future No. we trust to give a suitable Memoir of this good man. In him Unitarian Christianity has lost one of its warmest and wisest friends, one who understood and valued it, and constantly illustrated it in his life.

## MARRIAGES.

April 6, at the Unitarian chapel, Hindley, by Rev. J. S. Ragland, Mr. THOMAS RAGLAND to ELIZABETH RAMSDALE, of Wigan, second daughter of Mr. George FLETCHER, of Radcliffe Bridge.

April 10, at the Old meeting, Ilminster, by Rev. E. Whitfield, JAMES, second son of the late Richard Chaffey BAKER, Esq., of South Petherton, Somerset, to ELIZABETH, youngest daughter of the late John BAKER, Esq., of Ilminster.

April 14, WILLIAM STEPHEN, youngest son of Thomas B. SHOORBRIDGE, Esq., of Craythorne House, Tenterden, to Mrs. WILLIAM WANSEY, of Great Malvern, only surviving child of the late J. H. Alsop, Esq., of Leek, Staffordshire.

April 15, at the Abbey chapel, Tavistock, by Rev. J. Taplin, Mr. WILLIAM MALLETT to Miss MARY COOMB, both of Tavistock.

April 21, at the Unitarian chapel, Bridport, by Rev. John L. Short, Mr. RICHARD PINNEY to Miss ROSALIE HARRIET ROBERTS, both of Bridport.

May 1, at the Unitarian church, Birkenhead, by Rev. Russell L. Carpenter, CHARLES J. MEADE KING, Esq., of Liverpool, third son of Richard Meade King, Esq., of Pyrland Hall, Somerset, to CATHERINE HALL, eldest daughter of Wm. NEWTON, Esq., Birkenhead.

May 8, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. EDWARD HIGGINSBOTTOM, of Hooley Hill, to MARY ANN, daughter of Mr. John BRAGG, of the same place.

May 8, at the Friar-Gate chapel, Derby, by Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL.D., WILLIAM CALDWELL ROSCOE, Esq., of Dolgeorge, Montgomeryshire, to EMILY SOPHIA, youngest daughter of Mr. William HALIN, of Parkfield, Derby.

May 26, at the Unitarian chapel, Warminster, by Rev. John Lettis Short, of Bridport, THOMAS COLFOX, Esq., of Rax House, Bridport, to LOUISA, third daughter,—and at the same time and place, WILLIAM COLFOX, Esq., B.A., of Bridport,

to ANNA ELIZABETH, youngest daughter, of the late Henry WANSEY, Esq., of Sam-bourne, Warminster.

June 7, at the Unitarian chapel, Honiton, by Rev. W. Rowlinson, Mr. GEORGE GRESWELL, of Taunton, to MARGARET, eldest daughter of Mr. Matthew MURCH.

June 13, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. HENRY CASTLE to Miss ELLEN BUCKLEY, both of Dukinfield.

June 14, at the Old meeting, Ilminster, by Rev. Edward Whitfield, Mr. JEFFERY, of Bath, to MARY, only surviving daughter of the late Mr. LANG, of Ilminster.

June 16, at the New Gravel-Pit chapel, Hackney, by Rev. T. L. Marshall, ALFRED, youngest son of Edmund COLLIER, Esq., of Walthamstow, Essex, to SUSAN, only daughter of the late Charles SMITH, Esq., of Down Amprey, Gloucestershire.

June 20, at the Hope-Street church, Liverpool, by Rev. R. L. Carpenter, B.A., of Birkenhead, JOHN MATHEWS, Esq., to ELLEN, daughter of the late Mr. T. CASHEN, of Liverpool.

June 20, at Moor-Lane chapel, Bolton, by Rev. F. Baker, Mr. WILLIAM SHAWCROSS, of Manchester, to MARY HEYWOOD, daughter of the late John M'KEAND, Esq., of Lark Hill, Southport.

June 21, at Effra-Road chapel, Brixton, by Rev. John James Tayler, Mr. WILLIAM PLIMPTON, Clapham Road, to ELIZA ANNE, eldest daughter of Stephen TAYLER, Esq., of the Wandsworth Road.

June 22, at the Presbyterian chapel, Stourbridge, by Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., DAVID, eldest son of George MARTINEAU, Esq., of Tulse Hill, Surrey, to SARAH EMMA, eldest daughter of Robert SCOTT, Esq., of Stourbridge.

June 26, at the New Gravel-Pit chapel, Hackney, by Rev. Edward Tagart, the Rev. THOMAS L. MARSHALL, minister of the chapel, to MARY ELIZABETH, eldest daughter of Robert WRIGHT, Esq., of Clapton Square, Hackney.

ERRATUM—In our last Obituary, p. 389, col. 2, line 16 from the bottom, for ELIZABETH, read ELLEN.